

PSEP Non-Government Workgroup Meeting #6 – March 25, 2013

Attendees: Allan Hovis (Bayer CropScience), Bob Magee (DuPont Crop Protection), Carol Black (Washington State University), Don Renchie (Texas A&M University, Donna Farmer (Monsanto), John Jachetta (Dow AgroSciences), Tom Delaney (Professional Landcare Network, Inc.), Carol Somody (Syngenta)

Original information provided with the agenda and reviewed at the meeting is in black.

I. Where We Are:

“Increased university support” was noted as another funding idea. Note that longer term and/or inconsistent funding sources are very good funding ideas – just noted as longer term and/or inconsistent.

Long-term health of any PSEP requires a dependable source of base, noncompetitive funding.

Formula of some kind can take into account base funding, number of certified applicators, etc.

Contracts can guarantee indirect cost limits. Contracts longer than 1 year are more valuable for planning purposes.

Commitment to use unrestricted gifts specifically for PSEP with 0-10% overhead is possible in almost all states. Gifts must be targeted specifically to PSEP.

Most of our funding ideas are

a) medium to long term (2 – 4 years out):

Modified federal pesticide maintenance fees
Modified state pesticide registration fees
Increased PRIA contribution

and/or

b) inconsistent funding sources:

Direction of federal/state fines to PSEP
Existing EPA grants

Modified IPM grant language (NIFA/IPM Centers/IPM Coordinators)
Other government agency grants

II. PSEP Survey Trends and Next Steps (42 states reporting; NOT finalized, proposal for sustainable funding and PowerPoint presentation underway):

Carol Black and Bob Magee provided an update from the second meeting of the PSEP survey small group. Number of certified applicators is now being compared to PSEP funding level in each state. Regardless of number of applicators, there is a wide range in the financial health of the state PSEPs. Funding level per applicator in healthy states is being compared to that in other states, to better understand state and total deficits in funding.

A sustainable funding proposal is being developed which would create an organizational structure to provide “challenge” funds (based on current need and a commitment to meet certain criteria for improved health), and “sustainability” funds (until full health was achieved). Over time, states that met goals would require less funding. The model used for bulk inspections may be more appropriate than ACRC for this approach.

Legislative changes would be needed to get SLA funding to PSEPs where the process does not already exist. Industry support for increases in state pesticide registration fees targeted specifically to PSEP would be very important.

Currently, 35 universities have a billing mechanism (for PSEP training programs, study materials, etc.) but only 15 are generating at least \$50K annually. CA is the only state charging a (small) fee for approving recertification courses offered by others.

PSEP status: 15 healthy, 13 significantly impacted, 14 extremely impacted

Healthy programs receive significant support from one or more sources, especially 1) State Lead Agency support (Memorandum of Understanding, with funding) and/or 2) training program/material fees. Also university support (no FAC, etc.)

Only one PSEP is prohibited from charging for PSEP services.

Types of SLA MOU support include product registration (3 states), enforcement (1), certification (3), re-certification (1), other (10). However, 24 states receive no financial support from their SLA.

University assessed FAC on SLA MOU funds: negotiated lower rate (11 states), no FAC (8), full rate (1)

Gift funding strategies:

- A. Restricted gift with plan/report and 50% match (11 yes, 12 no, 9 unsure)
- B. Restricted gift with FAC prohibition (20 yes, 6 no, 6 unsure)
- C. Restricted gift with plan/report (21 yes, 3 no, 8 unsure)
- D. Unrestricted gift targeted to PSEP use only (30 yes, 1 no, 1 unsure)

Competitive funds: no benefit (24), benefit (6), no difference (10)

University fees on charitable contributions to their foundation: no fee (10 states), 5-10% (9), 15-20% (3)

At least 23 states can receive gifts (no scope of work) up to 20K without being assessed a different university service fee. At least 20 states can receive up to 60K.

Survey data follow-up need: Relatively high number of “na” answers concerning % university fees charged on gifts/grants to a targeted account, and relatively low number indicating unrestricted gifts as an acceptable funding strategy.

III. For Discussion - Some Hypothetical Scenarios for [Short-Term \(2014\) Non-Government Support for PSEP](#) (in best case, could become part of the sustainable funding proposal)

Model 4 was not supported. TPSA and RISE were added to the list of potential “processors” that already exist (for short term grants AND for the sustainable funding proposal). An organization that has members who could work intimately with every partner – industry, government, universities, associations, etc. – is needed. Of the four organizations now on this list (NASDARF, CLF, RISE, and TPSA), TPSA has membership representing all these entities. TPSA will be contacted regarding their capabilities.

I. 2014 Contributions to PSEP indirectly by interested organizations (via NASDARF or CLF, depending on further talks)

Model 1

- a) 4Q 2013 or 1Q 2014 contributions
- b) undefined contribution amounts
- c) split evenly among 50 PSEPs

Model 2

- a) 4Q 2013 or 1Q 2014 contributions
- b) 160K per contributing organization
- c) split evenly among 32 PSEPs

Model 3

- a) 4Q 2013 or 1Q 2014 contributions
- b) 150K contribution per organization
- c) split via agreed-upon formula, to 32 PSEPs

II. 2014 Contributions to PSEP directly by interested organizations (no middleman)

Model 4 – no attempt by contributors to coordinate timing, amount, targeted PSEPs, formula

Model 5 – attempt by contributors to coordinate timing, amount, targeted PSEPs, formula