

National Stakeholder Team For Pesticide Safety Education Program Funding

Conference Call 5—April 9, 2013

Archived documents available at <http://psep.us>

Fleeson moderated the call

- Opened with operational issues
- Mentioned that the detailed draft notes from Call 4 had distributed to the team for comments. Summary to be posted to the <http://psep.us> website
- Directed each Work Group Leader to share a bit about what was happening with their particular group

Somody, speaking for the Non-Governmental Group said that they were working on a variety of tracks and that call summaries were up to date and posted on the web. They have reached out to The Pesticide Stewardship Alliance and Crop Life Foundation to see if they could participate as a clearing house to process industry contributions. In addition, they have explored three main questions:

- What is the financial condition or the demonstrated financial needs of PSEP across the country? Good progress in this area has been made and Black will address this later in the call.
- What is the actual financial cost or price point needed per applicator? Magee will discuss this later in the call as well.
- What are the minimum expectations or standards industry and other players have for a PSEP? Clearly, the diversity of activities PSEP engages in and the resources they have (or don't have) means this question needs some attention.

Somody indicated they had reached out to EPA to better understand federal pesticide maintenance fees. PRIA and state registration fees are additional options, and Thostenson will discuss later what the State Work Group is doing.

She indicated that industry members of the team preferred a coordinated approach towards supporting PSEP rather than a company by company effort. One such approach will be introduced by Magee later in the call.

Helping PSEP could be a tiered approach rather than just an allocation on a state by state basis. Thus, those PSEP with few resources could be supported in a manner to get them up to a minimum level of self-sufficiency and activity and those more robust programs might receive some sort of general support to help sustain them in their pesticide stewardship programming.

Thostenson was asked by Fleeson to review the activities of the State Work Group. He indicated the brainstorming and research phase of their work was done. They were putting together a blue-print or roadmap of just how a PSEP could become self-supporting from state resources. A document is in progress. Drafts will be circulated to the group by mid-month and a final document with findings and recommendations will be available by the end of April.

Fleeson then addressed Federal Work Group activities. Most of the discussion can be found in the call notes posted to the web. There was considerable overlap with the Non-Government Work Group as they explored how maintenance fees and PRIA fees could be directed to PSEP. Members were researching how negotiated

enforcement action settlements might include PSEP support. How states could more easily support their PSEP with STAG funds was also being investigated. Other topics of discussion were: more PSEP friendly IPM RFA language, reducing overhead expenses on federal funds, and amending the Farm Bill. Fleeson indicated that they would likely have two more calls before they wrap up their work and they would focus on how to create a strategic message for PSEP to justify federal legislation.

Black was invited by Fleeson to give the Other Work Group report and then transition into their findings regarding the PSEP Financial Survey. Black said the group was spending most of their time on compiling, correcting, and describing what they were finding in the survey. However, they were still doing some work compiling a list of interested parties for supporting PSEP. Significant progress had been made in agriculture and commodity oriented groups but more work was needed especially on the non-ag institutions.

As for the survey, Black walked the group through the highlights. Black said that data was still being added (even as of yesterday, 4/9). We now have 50 states reporting. She reported extreme variability between states. The resource differences were huge and could not be accounted for based on applicator numbers alone. Some states had relatively huge programs and other state had very small efforts.

Somody asked if the data would be made available to the team in spreadsheet format. Black indicated that it could and should be made available to the entire team once the data was reviewed and any needed corrections made. Magee (who has worked closely with Black on this effort) indicated that a strong summary was needed to accompany the data so that folks could interpret it correctly. Black said anonymity of the data was also important and she thought that this was being taken care of by how states were being categorized in terms of numbers of applicators certified. Thostenson interjected that the data was being examined by many team members. There seemed to be good agreement that the data should be shared widely with the team once it was ready for prime time. Black indicated the Other Work Group would probably visit one or two more times via telephone during April and then the entire database would be made available to the Team.

Fleeson thanked Black and all the folks who were working on this survey and reiterated how crucial the data would be for making sound advocating decisions for PSEP.

Magee was invited by Fleeson to walk through his work of trying to document the financial needs of PSEP and a potential mechanism for meeting the need. Magee then shared his concept presentation. He emphasized this were just ideas rather than a firm proposal.

After his presentation, Smith asked if his proposal contemplated self-sufficiency for PSEP. Magee answered yes. Obviously some states had well developed programs for recovering their expenses from users and other state resources. The goal was to support PSEP with industry resources over a period of 3 to 5 years in a manner that would shore up the program. Once that was done, the resources would be pared back with the goal of all the PSEPs being able to support themselves with user and state resources for the bulk of their efforts.

Smith said that while he was new to the Team, he felt it was on the right track and he was very supportive of the direction the Team was taking.

Thostenson said that this effort of Magee's was awesome but considerable twists and turns were likely as more folks reviewed it. Magee agreed and suggested that some sort of steering committee be scoped out to work his concept. Black expressed enthusiasm for this.

The time was about 15 minutes past the hour and Fleeson asked that the Team and the work groups again focus their energies over the next month to pull their data and ideas together and start thinking about how this could be incorporated into a framework or road map document. She indicated that this concept of Magee's could be included in that document and then acted upon in the coming months.

The team adjourned without setting the date for the next call, but Fleeson said this would be forthcoming in the next week and would likely be in the first 10 days or so of May.