

## **PSEP Non-Government Workgroup Meeting #7 – April 8, 2013**

Attendees: Bob Magee (DuPont Crop Protection), Carol Black (Washington State University), Don Renchie (Texas A&M University), Jim Burnette/Renee Woody (North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services), Phil Mulder (Entomological Society of America), Tom Delaney (Professional Landcare Network, Inc.), Carol Somody (Syngenta)

### **1) Where We Are - 2 Weeks Later**

There has been much gathering and summarizing of PSEP data.

Information has been requested from EPA to help understand federal pesticide maintenance fees.

First discussions have been held with TPSA to understand the American Agronomic Stewardship Alliance model of funding storage site stewardship. TPSA could be middleman.

CLA/CLF survey indicates CLF is another possible middleman for fund transfer; no final decision on whether there would be overhead assessed.

New team members are the Council of Producers and Distributors of Agrotechnology (formerly the Chemical Producers and Distributors Association), Certified Crop Advisors (also representing the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants), and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (representative(s) to be determined after April discussions with the Regional Extension Directors). National groups and their state counterparts will be very important as we move beyond data gathering/summary phase.

### **2) Some Challenges with the Data**

Establishing a legitimate price point for funding is not easy.

State pesticide registration fees vary, with no correlation to 1) number of certified applicators, 2) PSEP health, or 3) SLA MOU contribution to PSEP. In general, these fees are low, with most ~\$200 or less.

County agents, SLA personnel and others at times provide significant personnel to the PSEP coordinator and assistant(s).

There are examples where state legislature/SLAs provide significant financial support.

State PSEP coordinators vary widely in what they think a healthy PSEP should be doing, and there are currently no minimum standards for PSEPs. There is a need for minimum standards.

It is important to determine 1) why some PSEPs indicate a need for much less funding than others (even when adjusted for number of certified applicators), 2) what “rising PSEPs” focus on

first, 3) what a tiered approach to funding would look like, and 4) if certain states (beyond healthy states) should be bypassed for initial funding support because of their current PSE goals.

### **3) The Latest Reiteration of the PSEP survey (50 states reporting)**

Carol Black circulated her draft summary of the state PSEP survey. It was then sent on to the full team for discussion during the April 9 full team teleconference.

### **4) Draft Proposal for a Pesticide Stewardship Partnership**

Bob Magee walked the workgroup through his draft proposal for a partnership to fund PSEP. He noted that states need to move toward self-sufficiency using a variety of ways but, since that could take ~5 years, an interim plan was needed.

Some comments beyond the proposal content:

The current PSEP funding per certified applicator ranges widely. Only one view of funding needs was presented. The proposed price point and perceived ability of states to move toward self-sufficiency were debated. State-specific pesticide requirements should support the goal of self-sufficiency, but the point was made that at least one state was now being challenged to consider consistency with federal law (which would mean certification for RUPs only). Elected officials are generally trying to reduce costs to taxpayers. There was concern indicated that increases in funding sources like federal and state pesticide registration fees would be passed on to buyers. It was noted that the restoration of a cohesive PSEP program was needed.

This draft proposal was then sent on to the full team for discussion during the April 9 full team conference.