

January 17

PSEP Funding Stakeholder “Other” Workgroup Conference Call

Attendees: Andrew Moore (NAAA), Carol Black (WSU), Carol Somody (Syngenta), Jack Peterson (AZDA), Jim Burnette and Renee Woody (NCDACS), Richard Gupton (ARA), Richard Pont (EPA)

Next Calls: January 31 at 3PM Eastern, February 26 at 3PM Eastern

- Call-In Number: 1-888-266-3096
- Pass code: 57968880

Acronyms

- AAPSE – American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators
- FAC – Facilities and Administrative Charges (refer to fact sheet at psep.us)
- NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service
- NAAA – National Agricultural Aviation Association
- NAAREF – National Agricultural Aviation Research & Education Foundation
- Operation S.A.F.E - Self-Regulating Application and Flight Efficiency
- PAASS - Professional Aerial Applicators’ Support System (education)
- PRIA – Pesticide Registration Improvement Act

Notes from Conversation

- Reminded group of the three other workgroups: Federal Support (USDA, EPA, NRCS, etc.), Non-Governmental (industry, commodities, etc.), State (state lead agency primarily, not sure if they are focusing on university strategies – must verify).
- Non-Governmental workgroup has spreadsheet on sponsorship funds to PSEPs with details about payment methods to limit/eliminate FAC (works at least at the \$5K level)
 - Experience with some sponsorships (not PSEP) at higher levels (\$10-25K) with minimal overhead via Foundation
- Surcharge on funds going into/received by universities doing contract research for pesticide registration – depends on how projects are structured
 - Research dollars provided as grant or gift with limited/no FAC or fees – could company voluntarily add additional dollars with a statement that a small portion of gift goes to PSEP, while the bulk goes to the research
 - Research dollars provided as grant or gift with university-charged FAC – could the university consistently stipulate a portion of the FAC be targeted to PSEPs
 - Note: research dollars to a university are sporadic and not as predictable
 - **ACTION ITEM Somody:** *assess (from one company viewpoint) the frequency of contributions avoiding the FAC. What would a company think about adding more dollars to a grant, gift, or project involving pesticides, specifically targeted to PSEP? If so, would a percent or flat fee be figured in – what is the average size of these gifts?*
 - **ACTION ITEM Black:** *assess (from one university viewpoint) the frequency of contributions avoiding the FAC. Would the university even consider taking a*

portion of FAC (as a percent or flat fee) on chemical industry dollars to support PSEP?

- North Carolina Pesticide Environmental Trust Fund – proponents did not accept standard university FAC rate, so negotiated a 9.5-15% limit.
- Universities can vary FAC based on whether the project is Extension, Research, on-campus, or off-campus. They also may have the option of receiving “revenue” for services (training, manuals, etc.) provided into a “service center (revenue) account”. Could the “service center” route be used for “payment” for base support?

ACTION ITEM Black: *Common university management fee assessed on revenue – what is this type of account called?*

- Some universities track “unrealized” management costs and get it back other ways (some are currently assessing whether/how to get some back)
 - It is important that any mechanism considered to support PSEP does not penalize the researcher
 - Companies making gifts can request advice from a specific university on ways to process gifts/grants with least amount of FAC/revenue fees.
 - Some faculty promotions can be impacted if their funding support does not incur adequate FAC.
- NAAREF is the charitable, scientific, and education foundation for NAAA. Three of its main programs include PAASS (original training/materials presented to attendees at state/regional association’s conventions on spray drift, security, and aviation safety), *Compass* Rose (new pilot support), and Operation S.A.F.E. (spray pattern/deposition assessment done with scientific equipment by trained analysts).
 - PAASS is the Professional Aerial Applicator’s Support System educational program, which state lead agencies approve for pesticide CEUs. The four-hour presentations with new content each year, is taught by trained aerial applicators to ensure transfer of knowledge to other aerial applicators.
 - PAASS is supported by fees charged to attendees (68% of program revenue for 2012); EPA assistance agreements (5% of program revenue for 2012); donations from chemical manufacturers, insurance underwriters, aircraft/engine manufacturers, and other companies allied to the aerial application industry (16% of program revenue for 2012); and individual operators and pilots (11% of program revenue for 2012).

Action Item: *stakeholder team should consider atypical groups that benefit from basic PSEP that are not usually considered for contribution (e.g. insurance companies that pay claims for drift, worker injury, etc.)*
 - NAAREF is a great model that we should better understand for obtaining contributions/support for pesticide safety education, expert committee developing training, and national distribution of training on safe pesticide application.
 - Could NAAREF serve as a national repository/partner beyond aerial applicators for managing funds?
- AAPSE – Would strengthening the membership or gifting to AAPSE be viable? AAPSE is a 501c3 organization, but with little operational expenses; thus, an influx of significant funds

(>\$100K?) would require accounting management. Suggest an advisory committee for the gift fund.

- **Action Item – refer to Thostenson:** Could a membership drive (dues) and/or gifting campaign support PSEP? What could legitimately be funded with gifts to AAPSE?
- Possible revenue streams for PSEP funding
 - Biotech companies – if biotech was connected to pesticide use
 - Nozzle, adjuvant, and equipment manufacturers
 - Industry – PRIA
 - Direct funding or repository
 - Alternate method - focus on pest management associations for national support, like the aerial applicator industry has done via NAAREF. Examples include Soil Fumigation, Turf/Ornamentals, Lawn/Garden, Golf, etc. -- is it possible to engage industry financial support? Look at the user categories and build around that – a problem is that they may focus on pest management and not pesticide management.
- Why reinvent PSEP? Can we rely more on other organizations? (Aerial, structural, general pest control, landscape, etc. with national or state focus)
 - What is the need for a base-training program for applicators?
 - National or state associations may offer technician schools, but those dollars support the association, not PSEP – though many may partner with PSEP for delivery
 - ARA just launched basic pesticide applicator training (certification of applicators) for ground practitioners. Partnering with university PSEPs.
- Ideas mentioned but not discussed
 - Contribution campaign to national repository – like IPM Voice
 - Who should pay – chemical companies upfront or downstream, users/associations or both

Post teleconference feedback

- Personalized license plates (in NC, the plates cost an extra \$30.00 a year, and \$20.00 of that goes to the organization) – would want exciting logo, national campaign
- National campaign fund drive (or PSEP project support by) involving ALL relevant companies (e.g. manufacturers of adjuvants, nozzles, spray equipment)
- Other endowed funds – Gates, Pew Trust, etc. with the goal of a 30 million dollar fund that could then live off its interest and not touch the capital
- The broader the net the less the cost – less the opposition. Kind of like the can deposit.
- Something like the milk levy which was “per milk container”