

Financial Support for University Pesticide Safety Education

All references that identify a particular state were edited to remove direct correlation.

41 states plus DC reporting

AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IN, KS, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY

1. Does your SLA currently provide financial support to university pesticide safety education programs? Select all that apply. (n=42; each item a percent of 42 respondents)

	Percent	Count
No	43%	18
Yes, using product registration/maintenance fees	24%	10
Yes, using certification or exam fees	17%	7
Yes, using enforcement/violation fines	12%	5
Yes, using business licensing fees	7%	3
Yes, using general fund dollars	10%	4
Other or I offer more information	21%	9

1. Product registration fees, applicator and dealer license fees all go to a General Inspection Trust Fund to support/fund program activities.
2. Not directly, however through a trust fund, several programs are supported university and other entities. We have provided additional assistance through "GRANTS" and at the direction of our Pesticide Board.
3. Discretionary EPA funding.
4. Through discretionary funding for special projects.
5. Occasional special projects from US/EPA discretionary funds and pesticide sales assessment funds. Financial support partially covers certification study materials and PSEP.
6. Yes, EPA grant funds.
7. PPG grant funds.
8. This is the first year we are providing funding from our EPA grant to the University. Our core Program is general funding, so we are utilizing part of our PPG to fund the C&T.
9. In addition to the above, we also use federal funds we receive for C&T through our Cooperative Agreement with EPA. We receive no general revenue and have a dedicated pesticide fund.
10. We offer programs for a fee to the licensed applicator community.
11. Contract with our agency using all funding sources but not specifically identified.

2. Where are pesticide maintenance/registration fees deposited in your state? (n=40)

	Percent	Count
State General Fund	5%	2
Funds dedicated to pesticide regulatory program	65%	26
Other (please specify)	30%	12

1. Funds partially go to dedicated pesticide revenue account and State General fund sweeps rest.
2. Pesticide Registration Fees are deposited in the Dept. of Ag. General Fund and are to be used to support the pesticide regulatory program. Trust fund fees are deposited in a non-reverting fund within the Department and used as authorized in G.S. 143-468 (b).
3. Part of the fee goes into the general fund for the purpose of pesticide enforcement and the remainder goes in the ag management account of the groundwater protection fund.

4. Pesticide Use Revolving Fund.
5. Pesticide registration fees are distributed to University Extension and state regulatory program.
6. Dedicated to our SLA-pesticide section.
7. Directly to the Department of Agriculture, but not directly to Pesticide programs.
8. General fund and then comes back to SLA.
9. Special fund managed by legislature, most come back to the SLA.
10. Money stays with the Department but most of the money goes to non-pesticide related programs.
11. For pesticide registration and to groundwater protection in the environmental agency.
12. Up to 6 different funds that have different purposes.

3. Does the legislature have to approve increases in pesticide certification and/or product maintenance / registration fees? (n=41)

	Percent	Count
Yes	88%	36
No	12%	5

1. A regulatory change is required, with a public process, through the Office of Administrative Law. Must receive legislative approval to increase our authority to spend funds above our authorized budget.
2. Except structural applicator licenses.
3. Yes to registration, no to certification fees.
4. There is a maximum registration fee in statute; regulations currently reflect that maximum.
5. Requires regulation change.

4. Are there statutory limits to increases in product maintenance/registration fees? (n=38)

	Percent	Count
Yes	45%	17
No	55%	21

1. Code limits fees to amounts needed to cover program and overhead costs.
2. Can be changed session by session via the legislature.
3. At this time (passed 2010), no fee increases can be sought by a state agency.
4. Must show program spending deficit projection for 2 years.
5. At the limit now.
6. Increases require changes in statutes.

5. If a specified amount of state fees / funds (e.g., certification fees, violation fines, product registration fees) could be dedicated to PSEP, could your agency pass those funds on to the university? Select all that apply. (n=34; each item a percent of 34 respondents)

	Percent	Count
Yes, with a MOU or Agreement (free of University overhead)	35%	12
Yes, with a MOU or Agreement (standard University overhead)	29%	10
Yes, direct from state funds to university, no contract with SLA	12%	4
Added directly to Univ. Budget from state with clause to support PSEP	9%	3
It would be difficult, but possible	24%	8
It would not be possible	9%	3

1. Must have a contract and specify deliverables for the funds.
2. Based on biennium updates approved by director.
3. Our pesticide programs are nearly entirely receipt supported from License, certification and registration fees. Our State Constitution requires that civil penalty proceeds ("violation fines") are to be transferred to the school system in the county in which the violation occurred—we do not get benefit from these penalties. It would not be possible, nor could we consider dedicating our limited funding to PSEP, no matter how worthwhile such arrangement might be.
4. Based upon availability, we have funded certain PSEP activities via contracts.
5. Limited funds are available and discretionary.
6. We have an annual contract for this purpose, paying 10% administrative overhead.
7. We currently operate with a MOU and amount of support is an agreed multiyear contract.
8. The University charges a 30% overhead fee; we would hire outside of the university to contract any work.
9. There are some circumstances where we can limit overhead.
10. Not sure if overhead can be reduced or avoided.
11. Yes under a grant to university and limits to university overhead
12. It would be a direct transfer as we are part of the university
13. They already get a portion, plus the contract I give them.

6. Philosophically, would you support a funding mechanism within your state? (n=38)

	Percent	Count
Yes	37%	14
Only if it did not put our staff positions at risk	29%	11
Unsure	32%	12
No	3%	1

7. Additional comments to be shared with the national PSEP Stakeholder Team.

1. We have done this for the last three biennium budget cycles
2. No one disputes the high value of PSEP. However, all SLA's continue to face their own funding crises, at the same time they experience increased demands for services. It is impractical to expect SLA's to carve out more of their already limited/decreasing funds to support the PSEP, which SHOULD be appropriately funded by USDA/EPA as part of their mission-critical endeavors.
3. PESP is currently funded through University support, \$10 for each registered product, training program user fees, and all fines collected. Fines and registration fees are deposited transferred directly into a PESP department account with the only stipulation that they be used for pesticide education.
4. Funding of PSEP is for specific projects/activities agreed upon between SLA and the PSEP coordinator prior to execution of a contract.
5. We know the value and importance of the PSEP program and have and will support it in any way possible
6. Looking at changing our regulations to allow mandatory training for certain programs that would allow the University to charge a fee.
7. XX state has a statute (RSA 430:31-b) established "Pesticides Training Program" for commercial applicators and dealers. Funds are derived from fees collected through training and deposited into a dedicated fund for training; the fund can only be used to support the purposes of the pesticides training program. The Division of Pesticide Control typically prepares and provides annual training sessions (two to four per year) through support of the fund. The fund is also used to purchase training materials and equipment used toward training efforts. Training sessions typically use University Cooperative Extension personnel (e.g., safety educators, entomologists) to provide presentations.

8. Currently provide funding to the university to partially support our Certification and Training Program. We currently approve continuing education courses related to pesticide safety and other topics. These courses are offered by many private and public parties including universities.
We do not subsidize the courses, although we often provide speakers to deliver our priority continuing-ed topics.
9. Our state pesticide safety programs are currently 100% supported through training fees —manual sales and registration fees for training courses. This appears to be sufficient funding for our state at this time. If a different source of funding, such as pesticide registration fees, was determined to be desirable, it could not put our existing staff positions or programs at risk. I'm not sure our registrants would support any additional fees for this purpose.
10. Education is the key. A good education program reduces environmental impacts, the number of applicators being found in violation, the amount of fines being assessed. Reality is, enforcement does not promote good stewardship or compliance education does.
11. If EPA decided to not send the funding to USDA but made it part of the State grant we would be willing to pass that directly to the University.
12. Need some control/oversight of the use of the PSEP funds.
13. This is a very poorly designed survey. These are already being done here and the survey doesn't provide for that.

