

PSEP Stakeholder Team—Work Group on State Support for PSEP Second Teleconference

January 29, 2013

Thostenson moderated the conference call which began at about 3:00 p.m.

The following were on the call:

- Black, Washington State University
- Burnet, Woody, et. al., NC State Lead Agency (SLA)
- Fleeson & Rengers, Virginia SLA
- Peterson, Arizona SLA
- Renchie, Texas A&M
- Pont, EPA Worker Protection Branch
- Scott, Indiana SLA
- Somody, Syngenta
- Thostenson, North Dakota State University

Acronym: FAC = Facilities and Administrative Cost, also known as indirect or overhead charges that universities apply to PSEP.

Discussed best time to have next call. Date and time fixed for February 12, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. ET.

Briefly reviewed notes from the previous call. Notes from that call along with additional member submitted comments and additions are posted at <http://psep.us>

Briefly reviewed what other groups were working on. Those notes are also at the above URL.

Thostenson asked Scott to walk everyone through how IN was able to get inclusion of PSEP into fee increase from product registrations.

Scott indicated that revenue needs for pesticide regulatory activities are regularly reviewed. It was determined that a fee increase was needed to meet regulatory requirements. Conversations with the PSEP Coordinator indicated that federal funding instability was becoming acute so it was decided to add PSEP into the request. The first place they started was to consult with industry leaders. Support for the fee increase was good and support for PSEP was strong. Thus legislature easily supported the increase. Some questions were raised about whether PSEP was just Ag oriented and this was quickly responded to, PSEP serves much more than just Ag. With no major concerns raised, the increase and the distribution was approved.

Thostenson asked Peterson if this sort of increase was proposed in AZ, how would they go about it? He indicated the IN approach would be similar for AZ. However, in AZ an increase would take a 2/3 vote of legislature, so considerable time and leg work would be required to accomplish a fee increase for PSEP.

Somody asked how industry could assist states in doing the leg work to get such a fee increase passed?

Burnette indicated that just as in AZ and IN, the folks in NC would need strong support from industry. If that support started with industry, it would make the going much easier in NC.

A general discussion ensued on how industry would likely start the ball rolling on this. Somy indicated that perhaps various trade groups at the national level could work with state PSEP's in a handful of appropriate states (3 to 5) as a pilot, to push for these changes. They might start by visiting with the PSEP Coordinator and the SLA to get advice on crafting the actual language and then the trade groups might approach the legislature to sponsor and promote the legislation.

ACTION STEP: The correct process for a pilot will be investigated.

Discussion took place on how supportive SLA's would be of this sort of legislation for PSEP. Fleeson indicated, based on previous survey work, that SLAs were generally supportive, though there would be, at some level, the natural tension between the regulatory goals of the SLA and the educational goals of the PSEP. Peterson indicated that in some states that do not have a strong PSEP, that it would be much harder to advance this sort of approach. Thostenson agreed, however in MI a couple of years back the PSEP was in dire straits due to funding and personnel problems, but strong leadership by the SLA and the sponsoring university administration overcame this and MI is back, though their funding is still tenuous.

Pont suggested that in addition to securing funding from registration fees, PSEPs also consider securing funding from various fee generation activities. This was discussed at length at the recent EPA sponsored Pesticide Regulatory Education Program meetings for SLA and PSEP partners in Davis in the fall of 2012. Thostenson responded that this approach needed to be used whenever and however a state could manage, but in some states they were simply prohibited from actually charging for their services. Thus there was consensus that not only should support for PSEP be obtained from new sources like registration fees, but also existing laws needed to be changed to enable PSEPs to charge.

Inevitably, as in the other workgroups as well as with the entire team, the discussion came back to the FAC charged by universities that sponsor PSEPs. Thostenson asked what sorts of negotiated FAC charges SLA's had been able to secure when putting together a memorandum of agreement with their respective PSEP?

- IN did not have a FAC and tried as best they could to avoid asking the PSEP for activities that would require them to be applied.
- VA did not have any FAC with their PSEP
- NC had negotiated a range of fees from 9 to 15%.
- AZ was able to negotiate a 10% FAC

Black indicated the "Other" work group was putting together a comprehensive survey of PSEPs to identify the range of FAC PSEPs faced. Somy asked if that survey would examine FAC for gifts; Black said that this was a part of the effort. Black indicated that in the course of their discussions it became clear that some states may not give sufficient academic credit to PSEP Coordinators for gifts obtained versus competitive grants. Renchie explained that this has been a problem in Texas, but that the overall PSEP effort, in terms of supporting the entire Texas economy, was such that this issue has been overcome. Black indicated that their survey would try to get a handle on whether or not PSEP Coordinators would suffer tenure and promotion discrimination when receiving gifts.

Thostenson said the hour was up and reminded everyone the next work group call would be on February 12, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. ET.