

WASHINGTON STATE COMMISSION ON PESTICIDE REGISTRATION

MINUTES (APPROVED)

July 9, 2002

FRANKLIN COUNTY PUD AUDITORIUM, PASCO, WASHINGTON

Chair Herb Teas, Presiding

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS at 10:00 a.m.

Commissioners in attendance: Ron Angel, Ben Barstow, Kevin Corliss, Bill Green, Ann George, Andy Jensen, Bill Mason, Chuck Masters, Doug Muse, Bryan Sakuma, Herb Teas, Kurt Volker, Doug Walsh

Staff in attendance: Donna Gorham, Alan Schreiber

Commissioners not in attendance: Bob Berger, Ted Maxwell

Guests: John Brown, WSU, Sandra Ristow, WSU

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Teas called for public comment. There were no comments.

MINUTES

Administrator Schreiber noted a copy of the proposed minutes for the May 8, 2002 meeting was included in the notebook. Schreiber asked for corrections. Andy Jensen asked for clarification on page four the discussion on the motion to accept the proposed budget. Schreiber noted Jane Thomas would present the potential impacts the budget cuts will have to PNN. Schreiber said the intent was to assess the impacts the budget cuts will have to operations and to potentially adjust budget cuts. John Brown noted he was in attendance as a guest.

Andy Jensen made a motion to accept as corrected the proposed minutes for the May 8, 2002 meeting.
Ben Barstow seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Schreiber updated Commissioners on the financial report from WSU. The report shows \$156,654.41 forward allocated through June 30, 2002. This represents 15.6% forward allocation for fiscal year 2002. Schreiber noted \$613,403.25 has been allocated but not expended for fiscal year 2002.

Schreiber continued with the fiscal year 2003 budget:

Operations	\$ 11,200
Administration	\$107,065
Attorney General	\$ 1,800
Commission Travel	\$ 5,500
WSU Fiscal Specialist	\$ 14,000
PNN	<u>\$ 47,000</u>
Subtotal	\$186,565
Old mandate	\$372,218
New mandate	<u>\$372,218</u>
Total	\$931,001

Schreiber said the original allocation for WSCPR was \$1,000,000 per fiscal year. The allocation was cut 2% for fiscal year 2002 allocation to \$980,000, and the fiscal year 2003 allocation will be cut 3% to \$931,000. Schreiber noted the total overhead expenses equal 14% (excluding PNN). Commissioners agreed this was an acceptable amount for overhead expenses.

Schreiber highlighted potential impacts to administrative services due to funding cuts. The vacant assistant administrator position will not be filled. The 2003 fiscal year will still include a similar number of proposals, the same number of meetings, management of a similar number of projects, hosting the tour, and preparation of the report to the legislature. Schreiber noted these activities account for in excess of 95% of the time spent on Commission activities. Other activities have suffered including the policy and procedures project and the third party labeling project and deadlines for some core WSCPR activities have not been met; such as the report to the Legislature, project status report and some handling of fiscal matters for the WSCPR. Schreiber anticipates it will take a full year for the workload adjustments to balance out.

Commissioner Green said he has been authorized by his management to spend 10% of his work time on Commission activities. Doug Muse said he felt the quality assurance project was important and time should be found to work on this. Schreiber noted the Commission can prioritize what projects receive time and agreed the project status report was important for the legislative report.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Schreiber said four Commissioners' appointments expire in September; Ron Angel, Chuck Masters, Doug Muse and Kurt Volker. Nominating agencies will be contacted after the Tour to start the re-nomination process. Ron Angel said a potential candidate has been identified for the applicators position. Schreiber said a candidate for the food processors position has been identified - Dan Robinson with Simplot.

Schreiber briefed Commissioners on expenses that had not been reimbursed by WSU. The expenses totaled \$1,229.62 and were related to Portland and Moses Lake meeting costs that were over the per diem amounts for meals.

Ann George made a motion to reimburse ADG, Inc for Commission expenses as itemized. Bill Mason seconded the motion.
--

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Teas asked for an update on the third party labeling project. Schreiber said no further progress has been made due to staffing levels and more pressing priorities. Teas asked if there was another entity to pass leadership on this project to. Schreiber said the only other possibility was some kind of a pan commodity group working together, for example Farm Bureau, or Washington Friends of Farms and Forests. Teas said this other group could do more of the footwork, with WSCPR still as the sponsoring organization. Schreiber said it might be necessary for the Commission to authorize funds to support another group working on this. Teas said he would talk to the Tree Fruit Research Commission. Doug Muse noted other groups, like the Vegetable Growers Association, may be interested in joining this effort. Ann George suggested putting together a coalition of groups to contract with ADG, Inc. Schreiber agreed a coalition may be the way to get this done.

Schreiber updated Commissioners on the 2002 Washington Pest Control Tour planning. Attendance is down in the AgChem sector due to several companies having scheduling major meetings at the same time as the Tour. The schedule of stops and activities is similar to previous tours held on the east side of the state. A reception will be held Monday evening to kick off the tour, Day One's route will include tree fruit, grapes, hops and currants, riparian buffer zone, lunch at the WSU Prosser IAREC station with tours of the insectary and Doug Walsh's lab, mint, organic alfalfa, and dinner at Columbia Crest winery. Day Two's route includes onions, sweet corn and sweet corn seed, carrots, radish and onion seed, lunch at the WSU Othello research station, potatoes, asparagus, and dinner at ADG, Inc research farm with two optional activities: a jet boat ride to the Hanford Reach or a technical wine tasting provided by Stimson-Lane. Day Three includes hybrid poplars, alfalfa seed, alkali bees, dry peas, lentils, chickpeas, with lunch near Dayton, barley, direct seed and conventional tilled wheat, mustard, safflower and canola. Commissioners

asked about emergency preparedness and insurance coverage. Schreiber said commission staff will carry radios and cell phones and local hospital contact numbers will be noted in the master schedule carried by staff. Bill Green noted since the WSCPR is the sponsoring agency for the Tour; insurance coverage is through the State of Washington.

PESTICIDE NOTIFICATION NETWORK

Jane Thomas provided Commissioners with potential impacts to the budget cut to PNN funding. Thomas said services for the Federal Register would be cut back, posting PNN notifications on the web page by year and notification number would not continue and a project to convert the PNN database to a web searchable database would be cancelled. Thomas said a notice was sent out to PNN users announcing the cutback. Ann George asked Thomas if she was comfortable with these cutbacks and if she can operate within the reduced budget. Thomas replied she could operate within the budget. Doug Walsh noted Thomas has done a good job updating the PICOL database. George agreed. Thomas said the label database is converted to a more user-friendly version. Schreiber asked what the lag time was from a label change to the time it was entered to PICOL. Thomas replied the time for the change to go to WSDA and then to PNN is about six months. Bill Mason asked if the email that went out to subscribers indication a reduction in service had a recommendation for other ways to get the needed service. Thomas said the email did not, that was good suggestion and she could have listed a way to get to EPA to get the information.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Schreiber briefed Commissioners on the WSCPR Stakeholder survey; 220 surveys were mailed to commodity groups and researchers (the RFP mailing list). The survey consisted of 26 statements that respondents could rank from 1 to 5, with 1 being strongly disagree with the statement and 5 indicating strong agreement with the statement. A response rate of 24% was received; the purpose of the survey was to get feedback on the RFP process and other Commission activities. Schreiber noted scores were higher than he expected and written comments followed three themes; communication of what WSCPR has accomplished, better and consistent policy on matching funds, and need for improvement regarding the WSCPR's relations with the organic industry. Schreiber said he intends to capture some of this feedback for the legislative report.

Schreiber noted areas for improvement to the RFP identified by the survey was a clearer matching funds statement and posting successful proposals on the web site.

Kurt Volker suggested adding a statement to the RFP with directions to see the website for an example of a successful proposal. Survey responses show no key elements are missing in the rfp. Volker suggested looking at scores below 4 to see if something can be done to improve the rfp and noted the rfp is fairly clearly written if you read it. Volker said the survey was a good idea that pointed out minor deficiencies.

Doug Muse asked if a letter would be sent out to respondents. Schreiber said he was happy with the response and had not thought about sending out a letter. Ben Barstow suggested following up with a random sample of non-respondents. Herb Teas suggested sending a survey summary out with the new rfp. Schreiber agreed to include the survey summary with the rfp mailing.

Chair Teas invited Commissioners to break for lunch at 12:00. The meeting resumed at 12:30pm.

RFP, continued

Commissioners continued discussion on changes to the rfp. Volker said to change on page one the first two lines under the month and year to all capitals underlined. Paragraph headings underlined. On page two, general information: the exact time proposals are accepted will replace "specific times". Barstow said to add "written" to the definition of a proposal. Schreiber said a survey respondent asked for multi-year funding and noted this is not an option. On page two, paragraph four: the limit is five pages and add a statement that attachments or supplemental information may be included but five pages should be sufficient. Jensen suggested changing "Proposal format" to "Proposal Application" (following on page 7), and specify font size 12 and 1-inch margins.

On page three, paragraph one: move entire paragraph to the first page under Intent. Paragraph two, Assistance: sentence one change to "...resistance programs can be complex...", change contact information

for WSCPR office/staff. Last sentence change to "...examples of successful proposals....", add sentence indicating WSCPR Commissioners are available to assist with proposal development and how to contact them. Paragraph 3, Budget issues: define old and new mandate in this section, change co-funding to matching. Paragraph 4: change co-funding to matching, add a sentence about filling out the time commitment form and add a box to the budget page of the application. Last sentence: change to "The ability or inability of a particular...". Paragraph 5, Travel: add sentence that travel 100 miles into Canada is not considered foreign travel for WSCPR purposes, and add a heading after the paragraph "Proposal Format". Walsh suggested adding a reference to the NASS website in description of problem paragraph.

On page four, Evaluation and Selection Criteria paragraph, add "include all that apply" to last sentence before the list of criteria. Barstow said to add a statement "...first time requesters are encouraged to submit proposals before the deadline to allow adequate time for staff to review...". Schreiber said to add a statement about proposal receipt and handling procedure. John Brown said an unbearable amount of proposals may be received and there may be a need to move a portion of the proposals to the next funding meeting. Teas said a note stating the number of proposals accepted will be limited by staff ability to handle them might be appropriate. Schreiber said he wanted to see how many proposals are received and thought Brown's suggestion would be an acceptable way to handle the situation. Schreiber noted proposals are assigned a proposal number in the order they are received.

On page five, Deadline paragraph: change the deadline to 45 days prior to the meeting, change meeting dates to October 29-30, 2002 and January 7-8, 2003, change meeting locations to be posted on the web site. Submission paragraph: change first sentence to "Submit one electronic or written copy of the proposal identifying the word processing program used, ...", change address, e-mail address, and phone number for Commission office. Resubmission Policy paragraph: replace the last sentence with "Changes made to the proposal must be clearly identifiable."

On page six: add a statement indicating funds for further projects will not be disbursed if the researcher has delinquent reports.

Changes to the form: next to project number, add a note to leave this blank; block 6, remove the note; block 7, change co-funding to matching; block 8, underline "in 150 words or less"; block 10, change the address for the Commission office; remove note above Problem Description; change note under Ranking and Prioritization to "include all that apply"; Project Budget, change co-funding to matching, add line for time commitment, add note "Inaccurate or unclear budget may result in rejection of proposal"; move budget review above quarterly expenditures; change dates by quarter; add statement to question on progress of previously funded projects "summarize progress in less than 200 words".

POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Bill Green requested Commissioners provide comments on the policy and procedure draft to him electronically. Green asked if the format should be bylaws or a series of policies. Teas responded to format as policies.

MEETING DATES

Commissioners set the following meeting dates and places for the remainder of fiscal year 2003: October 29-30, 2002 in Ellensburg, January 7-8, 2003 in Portland, Oregon, March 11, 2003 in Olympia at the Department of Ecology, May 8, 2003 in Moses Lake at the Washington State Potato Commission office.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Schreiber said there are specific guidelines in the enabling legislation to include in the report:

1. Priorities set by the Commission
 - a. Protection of the environment
 - b. Reduction of risk to human health
 - c. Economic development
2. State appropriations made to WSU within jurisdiction of the Commission
3. Evaluations, studies and investigations funded in whole or in part by such monies
4. Registrations and uses of pesticides made possible in large part by those evaluations, studies, and investigations

5. Matching monies, in-kind services and materials provided by agricultural organizations for those evaluations, studies, and investigations
6. Program or programs for tracking pesticide availability provided by the laboratory under the guidance of the Commission and the means used for providing this information to organizations of agricultural producers

Schreiber said at a minimum these points must be covered in the report. There will be two hearings; one for the House and one for the Senate or there will be a joint hearing. The enabling legislation states during the regular session of the legislature in the year 2003, the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and Senate shall evaluate the effectiveness of the commission in fulfilling its statutory responsibilities.

Green said the report should be a self-evaluation and have the data to back it up included. Schreiber agreed.

Schreiber continued: The cover page would include a photo and the title "Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration A Special Report to the Legislature 1995 – 2002. Page two will include an introduction including the history of establishing the Commission, a paragraph on the purpose of the Commission and a section on structure and function. Page three will include a list of commissioners and their nominating sectors, staff and liaison contacts. Walsh recommended including information indicating fiscal responsibility is through WSU. Page four will include the number of projects funded, the number of crops involved, funding totals, reference to an appendix listing groups submitting requests and a graphic display of funding amounts. A section on minor crop provisions and a pie chart comparing minor crop funding in comparison to other project funds. Schreiber asked Commissioners if they want to show administrative or non-project expenses. Commissioner consensus was that 15% is a good number for administrative costs and to include it for now. Commissioners suggested including administrative costs in the pie chart. A chart listing by year the number of projects, WSCPR funding, matching funding and total project dollars will be included. Page five will include a list of crops receiving support from WSCPR and the number of projects funded per crop.

Bill Green recommended explaining the processes involved such as the registration process and what a Section 18 is. Commissioners agreed and cautioned most Legislators will not be familiar with these processes.

Page six will include a description of funding priorities. Masters asked if the funding priorities were verbatim from the enabling legislation. Schreiber said the definition is an interpretation of the enabling legislation requirement. Masters recommended changing the format to a shorter version. Schreiber said the format would change as the report is formatted for printing. Page seven will explain how the Commission functions. John Brown requested including an explanation of why WSU is so involved with the Commission. Schreiber indicated this would be included in the report. Emphasis will be placed on the collaborative nature of projects and an appendix of entities receiving WSCPR funds will be included. Pages eight and nine will list accomplishments: the number of Section 24c registrations, Section 18 exemptions, Section 3 registrations, projects that are in progress and projects that were dropped and why. A one or two sentence explanation of each type of registration will also be included. Commissioners suggested separating projects that were not successful. New mandate projects will also be discussed, such as IPM in schools, the cereal leaf beetle parasite release project or development of the WSU insectary. The percentage of 24c and 18s supported by WSCPR funds will be determined and included. An appendix of projects will be included.

Ann George suggested having Bill Green or Bill Mason take the final draft to individuals in their agencies for review – individuals who are on the same level of understanding as the legislators. Schreiber agreed. Schreiber noted the page flow would be different once the sections are more fully developed.

Page ten will have an in depth discussion about environmental protection with one or two examples. Brown suggested no-till wheat. Schreiber suggested scotch broom. Page eleven will include an in depth discussion about protection of human health with one or two examples. Page twelve will include an in depth discussion about economic impacts with examples. The value of the projects supported will be in excess of

\$500 million and does not include economic impacts to other states. Brown suggested including specific examples that account for a large portion of the impact and explain those projects. Bill Green said when the commission was organized, the legislature put the commission into Chapter 15.92 of the RCW and every chapter of the RCW has findings. Green went back to the findings for Chapter 15.92. The Finding reads, “The legislature finds that public concerns are increasing about the need for significant efforts to develop sustainable systems in agriculture. The sustainable systems would address many anxieties, including the erosion of agricultural lands, the protections and wise utilization of natural resources, and the safety of food production. Consumers have demonstrated their apprehension in the marketplace by refusing to purchase products whose safety is suspect and consumer confidence is essential for a viable agriculture community in Washington State.” Green said the legal charter for this commission does not talk about financial assistance to agriculture. Legislators will be expecting the report to tell how the Commission is meeting the findings in the RCW. Teas asked if the report should not capture dollars. Green said financial impacts should be included but the Commission should not be presented solely as a financial assistance program. Ann George noted this is an interesting way to approach the report. Green said food safety could be addressed with new chemistries registered. Masters noted this becomes a value added discussion. Green said there must be a strong agricultural community for a clean environment in rural areas. Schreiber said a page on food safety would be added. George suggested working food safety into the beginning pages where the mandate and rationale for the Commission is discussed. Green suggested referencing the RCW in the text instead of paraphrasing the legislation. Schreiber agreed. Commissioners suggested adding a page on the survey feedback. Page thirteen will discuss development of IPM projects and examples such as IPM in schools, mating disruption in tree fruit and the potato IPM project. Page fourteen will include a description of organic research efforts. Barstow suggested including the project with corn gluten on strawberry that was not successful. Ann George noted it might be worthwhile to discuss other concepts that researchers have been investigating, not just organic projects. Walsh suggested including a page with statement from commodity groups or other groups supported by WSCPR. Schreiber agreed. Page fifteen will discuss regional cooperation, for example, the cranberry project that included Washington, Oregon, British Columbia, and the Cranberry Institute or the dimethoate/dry pea/green pea project in Oregon, Washington and Idaho. Page sixteen will include other activities such as PNN and the Tour. Page seventeen will cover concluding statements. Page eighteen, the back cover, would have another picture. Green suggested including a map with reference numbers to the individual crops.

Green said the report should talk about where we have been and where we are going, every section of the report should have a purpose to accomplish with the legislature. Green suggested summarizing the survey responses and giving the legislature initiative to do something. Schreiber said a plan is needed about what we want to do and asked Commissioners if they want to open the legislation and ask for restoration of funding. Commissioners expressed concern about opening up the legislation. Ann George asked what the agenda for the September meeting would include. Teas responded the legislative report and the policy and procedure document would be the focus for the September meeting. Schreiber noted a more detailed draft report would be ready for the September meeting.

<p>Ann George made a motion to dedicate a portion of the September meeting agenda to a visioning session to discuss where the Commission is going in the future and whether a name change, mission statement changes or other structural changes are desirable. Kurt Volker seconded the motion.</p>
--

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Teas asked for any new business. Ann George asked Commissioners to keep in mind in regard to organics – there is a study currently being done within WSDA on the possible establishment of an organic commission. George suggested looking for a way to link the WSDA effort and a possible liaison with WSCPR.

Chair Teas adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.