

# Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration

## Teleconference Minutes

February 25, 2005

Participating in the teleconference were: Kurt Volker, Chair; Chuck Masters, Vice-Chair; Ann George, Treasurer and Bob Berger  
Alan Schreiber, Administrator; Laurie Wishkoski, Assistant Administrator

The teleconference started at 1:07 pm.

Kurt Volker began the meeting asking whether or not everyone had had the opportunity to see the comments which he had sent out earlier. Everyone had read them. Ann George thanked Kurt for taking the time to provide the forum to begin the screening process. Alan Schreiber also appreciated Kurt's comments and added the further suggestion that the screening proceed through the proposals in numerical order.

Prescreening guidelines.

The following guidelines were based on recommendations made to the Administrator at the January meeting of the WSCPR. These recommendations were included in the RFP. This information was more formally written out as guidelines after discussions between the Commission Chair and the Administrator. The guidelines were shared with and agreed to by the Executive Committee prior to review of the proposals.

The prescreening process is just that, a process. Proposals should adhere closely to the WSCPR guidelines. If a proposal does not adhere to the guidelines it should not be reviewed. Look at each proposal for scientific merit, urgency of need, and immediacy of benefit/results which is the usual procedure. The prescreening may or may not require you to do the normal in-depth proposal review.

If you have reservations on a proposal and want to forego a proposal presentation and review at the March 16 meeting then please state that in your comments. This will provide the Administrator with some justification as to why the proposal was not heard at the next meeting. Whatever method is used to report your opinion please make it clear as to whether or not the proposal should be presented to and reviewed by the whole WSCPR and your reason(s) for rejection or review. In addition to merit, etc., please remember there are limited funds available for this proposal review/funding meeting

Kurt Volker reminded the Executive Committee the reason for the prescreening exercise was to try and limit the proposals to those which would have the best chance of being funded, thereby, making the number of proposals to be reviewed manageable for the upcoming meeting on March 16. If there were significant reasons to not review the proposal in this special funding meeting, such as, noncompliance to format, significant problems with objectives or procedures,

inadequate match, etc., the Commissioners should make note of them in order to document the reason(s) a proposal would not be heard. Just because a proposal is considered does not guarantee funding.

The commissioners began the screening.

05PG060 Ann George offered the information that she had called IR-4 to get more information on the status of this research within that system. She spoke with Matt Hengel who said that most of the work had been done but lab work was still to be done. Money from the WSCPR would help to expedite the process. WSCRPR funding would be appropriate. All commissioners voted yes.

05PN061 All commissioners vote yes.

05AN062 Ann George abstained. The remaining commissioners voted yes.

05AN063 Ann George abstained. Kurt Volker stated that this proposal and 067 might be better considered as a merged project. Ann George responded that although there was some overlap in study the researchers were in different geographic areas. The remaining commissioners voted yes.

05AN065 Three commissioners voted no and one had questions. Kurt Volker remarked that the proposal was non-agricultural and very narrow in scope, affecting only five golf courses in the Seattle area. Alan Schreiber said that a proposal should not be excluded just because it was not agriculturally based. Bob Berger added that the purpose of the Commission was to deal with minor crops and minor use issues. Bob Berger said that he liked the concept of being a demonstration project. Chuck Masters commented that this issue was no more than implementation of already existing guidelines. Ann George added that other groups had worked to establish Best Management Practice's and if this group was committed to this goal then there were other ways to proceed. Kurt Volker said that he didn't see this as having a broad application. Bob Berger countered that as a successful demonstration project this could have a major impact affecting eventually most of the golf courses in the Seattle area.

05PN066 All commissioners voted yes.

05AN067 Ann George abstained. The remaining commissioners voted yes.

05AN068 The commissioners were split in their votes. Kurt Volker voiced concern that there was no indication of tree size. The discussion of current practices was incomplete. There was no indication that conversations had taken place with the registrants indicating a willingness on their parts to participate in label changes. Kurt Volker indicated that the practice was already in widespread use. Alan Schreiber was concerned that no match from the Tree Fruit Research Commission. Chuck Masters said that it would be very difficult to quantify the factors in this proposal but it would be very good information to get. The commissioners voted no on this proposal.

05PN069 The commissioners voted 3-1 in favor of this proposal. There were serious concerns regarding the rates of applications. These needed to be addressed in the presentation.

05AN070 The commissioners all voted no on this proposal. The general concerns were an overall lack of consideration of the economics of rangelands. The cost of clipping plus the cost of the polymer (rates between 240 to 1210 gal/ac) in addition to the application costs. There was also concern voiced over the relative lack of need for this information relative to other projects.

05AN071 The commissioners voted against this proposal. Alan Schreiber questioned whether the project was actually within our purpose. This seemed to be a different type of project geared for the purpose of educating students and not growers. It also seemed to the commissioners that this was a project that while interesting should be funded by WSU.

05AN072 Kurt Volker had questions about the proposal. Chuck Masters gave information that he had received. The focus of the proposed project was on runoff and finding pesticides in water. This project aimed to place the emphasis on the residential arena. After some discussion all the commissioners agreed that they wanted to hear the proposal.

05AN073 All the commissioners voted against this proposal. The main concern was that all of the WSCPR funding was to go to equipment purchases. There was a general expectation that IAREC should already have a growth chamber.

05AN023 All the commissioners voted to see this proposal. There were several possible caveats mentioned. The harvester must be moved to the Mt. Vernon station in 2006. The amount of funding being requested could be increased to account for the rest of the payments, in this way eliminating the return of this proposal next year. It was requested that the presenters bring a print out of the principle involved and the remaining payments.

05AN026 All commissioners voted yes. Appreciation was expressed that the presenter had supplied answers to the questions that had arisen during the previous presentation in January. Alan Schreiber indicated that a great deal of time had gone into working with the people involved in this proposal. The goal was to leave the proposal in its original form and also supply the needed answers or adjustments. In this way allowing the commissioners to see their original criticisms and be able to respond to them.

05AN042 All commissioners voted to hear this proposal.

05AN043 All commissioners voted to hear this proposal.

05PN031 After some discussion, all the commissioners voted to see this presentation. Kurt Volker suggested that the video may not be a necessary part of the research.

05AN074 Chuck Masters indicated that he had spoken with Heather Hansen about the proposal and had reviewed it. He had spoken to Heather Hansen previous to this teleconference. Heather Hansen had relayed those concerns to Chris Grue but had not yet received a response. The principle of the proposal was a good idea, but Chuck Masters felt that it was critical to have

credibility for the work to be of any value. He added that requesting or requiring a peer review of the work plan may be in order. He had concerns about what he felt were weaknesses in statistical areas. All commissioners voted to hear the proposal. Ann George asked about the matching funds. Alan Schreiber responded that the issue of the matching funds had been discussed with Chris Grue. Funds that had already been spent would not be used as matching funds. The Friends of Farms and Forests had not yet allocated the money so it would be important to scrutinize the funding at the presentation. Alan Schreiber commented that this is work being done in one of the most critical areas of pesticide issues in the state. Chuck Masters added that as such it was absolutely critical to have credibility or the research would provide a non-believable result. He recommended peer review of the project and to go over the protocol. Commissioners agreed to hear the proposal.

05AN075 The commissioners all voted to hear this proposal. Kurt Volker recommended that the goal should be to first prove that meadowfoam had an effect. The proposal could be simplified and made more cost effective.

05AN076 The commissioners all voted to hear this proposal. The presenter would be asked to differentiate this proposal from her previous work.

05PN027 The commissioners all voted no for this proposal. The concern was lack of clarity. The work and the protocol seemed vague and poorly designed.

It was decided that with 16 proposals being invited to be heard at the March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting that the beginning time would be 10 am. The meeting would be scheduled to go from 10 am to 5 pm.