

PSEP Non-Government Workgroup Meeting #3 – February 11, 2013

Attendees: Allan Hovis (Bayer), Carol Black (Washington PSEP), Carol Somody (Syngenta), Linda Johns (Montana Dept. of Agriculture), Sarah McLallen (CropLife America), Scott Jackson (BASF), Tom Delaney (Professional Landcare Network), Jim Burnette/Shannon Joyner/Renee Woody ((North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services)

1) Brief Update on Highlights of Other Three Workgroups

Federal Workgroup has started a summary sheet of potential funding sources. IPM Center and State IPM Coordinator capability to fund pesticide safety education continues to be evaluated.

State Workgroup has discussed a successful example of a state pesticide regulatory fee increase specifically to support the state's PSEP, with the support of industry. Another state would require a 2/3 vote of the legislature for such an increase. Next step is to determine the correct process for having a small pilot with selected states.

Other Workgroup has developed and sent out a detailed survey to all state PSEP coordinators to gather information that is critical to several of the workgroups. Almost half the states have already responded.

2) ACRC-Type Model for Funding PSEP

Sarah McLallen summarized key points when considering an ACRC-type model for PSEP funding. Her points were often applicable to other funding ideas as well:

- a) membership – who is really going to pay?
 - b) free-ride problem – what if some organizations refuse to pay?
 - c) revenue stream – what is the long-term, sustainable funding strategy?
 - d) taxes – what are the ramifications of different options?
 - e) use boundaries – what restrictions can/should be put on the use of the funding?
 - f) coordination – who will run the program and how much time/money would it take?
- Post-meeting note: could this be voluntary as part of the sponsorship benefit?*
- g) mission – what are the goal(s) and services and are they measurable? Funding for all or for struggling PSEPs?
 - h) start-up time and financial resources

3) PRIA

A possible increase in PRIA funding for PSEP has been considered by some of the team to be one of the more equitable and simpler solutions, but in reality it is quite complicated. CLA is engaged and considering various ideas.

4) CropLife Canada

CropLife Canada's feedback (1/29/13 memo), concerning its roles in training pesticide applicators, indicates that CLC does not play a large role in direct training of applicators similar to that done by PSEP.

5) Other Key Non-Government Organizations Not Currently on Team

A few that have been brought to various team members' attention, over the last few weeks, as possible candidates for the Stakeholder Team (and also the survey):

Council for Producers and Distributors of Agrotechnology (adjuvant association)

North American Certified Crop Advisors Board – link is <http://naicc.org/> (*Post-meeting note from Allan Hovis*)

Chemical Producers and Distributors Association (*Post-meeting note from Other Workgroup meeting*)

No association of nozzle manufacturers has been identified.

Other ideas welcome – for Team and/or Survey

6) Final Comments on Non-Government Survey Questions

Can the survey questions be shared with various members of an organization? Yes, and then summarized by the organization contact into one survey response

Should the survey go out via Survey Monkey or as a Word Document? Via Survey Monkey, to provide some summarization capability and easily identify any duplicate responses from the same organization

Are there any changes to survey? Add free-text "Other Comments" section

Should survey go to the Stakeholder Team and non-team organizations at the same time? No, send the survey first to the Team, which will let us identify any problems with the survey before wider distribution

Should an invitation be drafted and sent to other identified organizations to join the team at this time? Yes