

## **PSEP Non-Government Workgroup Meeting #5 – March 11, 2013**

Attendees: Allan Hovis (Bayer), Bob Magee (DuPont), Linda Johns (MT Dept. of Ag.), Carol Black (WA State Univ.), Carol Somody (Syngenta)

### **I. Brief Update on Workgroup Activities**

#### **1) PSEP and IPM (Federal Workgroup activity)**

An assessment of the IPM RFA's continues, with the latest attention to the newly released Extension IPM grants.

#### **2) PSEP State Support (State Workgroup activity)**

State Workgroup is developing a roadmap to help PSEPs pursue state support.

#### **3) PSEP Survey (Other Workgroup activity)**

Recent work has focused on follow-up with certain PSEPs to confirm the data.

### **II. Non-Government Survey**

Survey response remains light. We are particularly interested in getting information from CLF and NASDARF on their ability/charges to serve as processors of gifts, grants, and/or contracts, and are following up. Due to the light response from Team members, we have delayed approaching additional organizations that are not on the team.

### **III. Other Non-Government Workgroup Activities**

Both the National Alliance of Independent Crop Advisors and the North American Certified Crop Advisors Board are interested in joining the team. We will bring them quickly up to speed. Contact was made with an Extension representative to APLU, who could not represent university interests but provided another name; the initial contact had been made.

“Position” developed by the 3 registrants on the February 25 Non-Government Workgroup call has been vetted with the other 3 registrants on the Team:

“(Registrants) need three things – demonstrated need, price point, and commitment to use for PSEP. Need these by July 1 at the very latest, for PSEP to be considered for 2014 funding. One year funding with option for renewal is the easiest model. All three registrants have good experience with/confidence in unrestricted gifts, with “gratis” (unrequired) report being provided. PRIA is still the desired funding mechanism long-term (most equitable, even if not easy). PSEP deserves registrant support.”

All six registrant representatives on the team believe that PRIA is the desired funding mechanism long-term. (Note that this does not necessarily mean their management will concur, as

discussions continue). Four of the six registrants have indicated that unrestricted gifts are a viable option for their organization to consider for 2014, one is still exploring this, and one does not think it is an option. Several registrants are pursuing, or will pursue, further discussions on PSEP funding options with CLA staff, CLA committees, and CLA industry membership. Carol Somody thanked all the registrants for the variety of interactions they are engaged in to help PSEP.

**Demonstrated need** will use not only the PSEP survey results but provide the variety of activities that a viable PSEP engages in (including the certification of industry field personnel).

**Price point** will be developed using the PSEP survey results, with several scenarios of support.

**Commitment to use for PSEP** has been proven possible in all 50 states, with their ability to agree to the following:

- 1) that the funds are to be used by the Pesticide Safety Education Program to support the education of pesticide users and dealers who must be certified to use or sell pesticides.
- 2) that there are no restrictions concerning the type of certified applicator, urban or rural use, types of pesticides, etc.
- 3) that the funds are specifically intended for the Pesticide Safety Education Program and not other programs.

#### **IV. First PSEP Survey Results**

First snapshot of data from the 42 states responding to the PSEP survey was provided by Carol Black. The data are very preliminary and will be analyzed in detail by a small group of Team members over the next few weeks.