

Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration

July 11, 2007

Agriculture Development Group, Inc. Research Facility

Etopia, Washington

Charles Masters, Chair

Approved Minutes

Commissioners in attendance: Chuck Masters, Rick Hamman, Ann George, Doug Walsh, Ben Barstow, Byron Phillips, Kurt Volker, Bryan Sakuma, Jay Schafer, Cynthia Lopez

Staff present was: Alan Schreiber and Laurie Wishkoski

Guests present were: Vicki McCracken, Catherine Daniels and Jane Thomas

Chair Masters called the meeting to order at 10:27 am.

All persons present were well known to each other so introductions were dispensed with.

Minutes

Chair Masters called for comments or corrections of the minutes from the June 5, 2007 virtual meeting. Erik Johansen said that the phrase on page 6 should read...or Section 18's.

Ben Barstow moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ann George seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Financial Report

Alan Schreiber gave the financial report. The first item discussed was the budget. Alan informed the commissioners about the sponsorships for the Tour. Ann George said that the Hops Commission would send in \$500. Alan Schreiber went through the budget and explained the costs. Explanations of all expenses were given. The year end accounting was examined and explained. Expenses are explained item by item. The expenses for the year were over budget for the meetings designation and under budget for operating expenses. The checking account has increased because some of the tour registrations have come in. The next section of the financial report is the detail of the checks that had been written during the past fiscal year.

Ann George asked if there could be a designation of money that was allotted for projects. Alan Schreiber replied that that would be a relatively easy calculation to do. Alan Schreiber said that he would make sure that it happened and email the information out to the commissioners. Kurt Volker said that he would like to see the money allotted and also what percentage of the total funds this amount reflected. Vicki McCracken said that if the WSU generated reports were difficult to understand then a more useful version could be worked out. Alan Schreiber replied that he did not think that this would be necessary. Alan felt that it would be possible to glean this information from the existing reports.

Kurt Volker moved to accept the financial report. Byron Phillips seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Administrator's Report

Alan Schreiber told the commissioners that Vicki McCracken had scheduled a teleconference with the WSCPR staff. The staff has spent time collecting examples of problems that had occurred. The examples were not needed. Mike Petrusky will be working with the WSCPR rather than Tucson Smith. Stacey Hill will also receive training on how to submit information working within the state guidelines. Alan Schreiber said that in the past the relationship between WSCPR and WSU had been strained and difficult. The relationship now is quite good. It would be acceptable to carry on as the situation is right now but the amount of time taken to process some contracts remains a problem.

Tour Report

Alan Schreiber told the commissioners that he and Laurie Wishkoski had made a trip to the Skagit Valley, in part, to firm up arrangements for the upcoming Tour. It was

established that the first stop of the first day would be at the Mount Vernon research station. The second stop would be at Washington Bulb. From Washington Bulb the Tour would go to Curtis Johnson's and proceed with a walking tour. This will be a "Crop Walk". Crops seen along this walk will be beet seed production, broccoli, peas, and spinach seed production. The Crop Walk would end up at La Conner Flats, an old granary, for lunch. The Tour would leave after lunch and go to look at a tide gate and talk about water issues. Jim Cowles will be on the Tour to talk about the results that WSDA has collected. Jay Schafer said that he had lost a quarter of a spinach field due to a poorly maintained tide gate. From the tide gate the Tour would go to visit Merritt's apple orchard and retail shop then to Sakuma Brothers to look at small fruits and eat ice cream. The Tour would then go to Deception Pass and Bowman Bay for dinner. After dinner the Tour would drive down Whidbey Island and take the ferry across.

The second day of the Tour would look at greenhouse/nursery issues for ornamental agriculture with Gina McCauley at DeGoede's wholesale nursery facility in Sumner. Then the Tour would go to the Puyallup Research Station to look at structural pests at the new building that WSCPR had helped finance. The last stop of the morning will be at the Meadow Park Golf Course in Lakewood. This stop addresses the chemical use and problems encountered in such an urban setting. The golf course also has a salmon bearing stream that runs through it. Lunch will be at the Weyerhaeuser Mima Nursery facility south of Olympia. Right of way issues would be discussed en route to Willapa Bay. Cranberry production and noxious weed issues would also be addressed.

The third day of the Tour would involve going out into Willapa Bay on an oyster schooner. The tides will dictate the timing of this day's stops. After the look at salmon, spartina, oyster production and burrowing shrimp issues, the Tour will go to Nemah for a stop to look at work being done for sustainable forestry. Lunch will be at the Nemah stop. Then the Tour would return to the hotel at SeaTac.

Kurt Volker asked how many more could be accommodated on the Tour. Alan Schreiber replied that another 12 people could still come. Kurt Volker said that he thought that it would be a good idea to really lobby for attendees.

Alan Schreiber gave a report on burrowing shrimp.

Lunch

Alan Schreiber gave the commissioners and guests an update on the crops and work that were being done this year at Agriculture Development Group, Inc.

Request For Proposals

Alan Schreiber reminded the commissioners that the RFP and the disbursing of funds is one of the more important things that WSCPR does. The RFP will go out to hundreds of potential applicants, agencies and commodity groups. The RFP must be released in August to allow adequate time for the applicants to apply by the deadline of 30 days prior to the meeting at which the proposals will be examined. Cynthia Lopez asked about the

funding mechanism. Alan Schreiber explained the funding and the designations within WSCPR. Rick Hamman asked what WSU contributed that warranted the money that they received. Alan Schreiber replied that ADG/Administration of WSCPR only worked with a small amount of the funds. The majority of the funds goes to the projects and is administered by WSU. Alan Schreiber gave a history of the increase in funds and the scope of funding that could be done. This is the basis for the old mandate and new mandate designations of the proposals. It is important that a full suite of approaches and products are maintained for agriculture in the state of Washington. Ann George asked if there was anything that needed to be done based on the feedback in this past year since the commissioners had updated the RFP. Alan Schreiber said that he wished that there was a clearer voicing of the Commission's priorities. Alan Schreiber continued by saying that further defining the priorities would eliminate the freedom to respond to changing problems. Ann George asked if there were more really good proposals than the Commission was able to fund. Alan Schreiber replied that it didn't seem so right now. Cynthia Lopez asked how many proposals were submitted each year. Alan Schreiber answered that there were 60-70 proposals submitted each year. Chuck Masters added that there seems to be a set of researchers that have the ability to create projects that are useful and who do work of sufficient merit to be funded. The funding goes to applied, needed research. No funding is given to proposals that yield only "good to know" information. Cynthia Lopez asked for a definition of affected user group. Alan Schreiber responded that proposals are not accepted from researchers. It is the end-user community that makes the application. Kurt Volker added that the broad guidelines are useful in supporting the wide array of research that is funded. Jay Schafer said that the budget source clarifications were important. Alan Schreiber referred to the final page of the RFP. Alan told the commissioners that this section has been the most common problem area. An asterisk and further information will be given. Doug Walsh commented that he would like to see the term co-funding used rather than the term matching funds. The term additional sources could be used to indicate funding that had been received but not allowed to be termed matching funds. Chuck Masters asked about the budget section for salary amounts and rates of pay. Alan Schreiber asked if it was necessary to know what rate of pay is used. Chuck Masters replied that it was useful to assess the ability of the proposal to do what it wants to do or to assess the validity of the request. In this case, more information is better. Discussion took place regarding the weight that is given to different groups depending on the percentage of money and the ability to raise money. Rick Hamman asked about the importance of the designation as old mandate or new mandate. Vicki McCracken said that it was possible to list as a percentage of different types of work. Byron Phillips asked for information about the AN and PN designations. GLP work would directly result in registration. Rick Hamman asked what was done with all of this information. Alan Schreiber replied that the information is entered and track is kept for reporting purposes and to follow up on work that is being done. The work generated has been good value for the money. \$9 million has resulted in \$1 billion worth of benefit. Byron Phillips asked how many proposals are returned for not following the guidelines. Alan Schreiber explained the process that is followed. Erik Johansen asked about an incorrect citation. Vicki McCracken said that she would investigate to find out the proper funding terminology and get back to Alan.

Future Funding

Ann George reported on a meeting that Dean Bernardo had called. Ann and Andy Jensen had both been asked to serve on what Dean Bernardo called a Kitchen Cabinet. The meeting was in June. Ann George told the commissioners that she had told the Dean that when WSU was cut then WSCPR was cut also. Ann then asked Dean Bernardo if that meant that WSCPR would likewise receive a portion of the money that WSU had received from the legislature. Dean Bernardo answered no. The money that had been given to WSU had specific purposes. It was noted however that not all of the WSU request was funded and the Dean was considering going back to the legislature to ask for additional funding for extension offices. It would be possible to put WSCPR in as a line item. Vicki McCracken said that it could not be said that WSCPR had lost the funds and wanted them replaced. The Commission would have to have very specific purposes for the money. Ann George went on to say that the Dean was committed to generating a block of funds for targeted internal grants. There is hoped to be \$800,000 to \$1 million to be set aside for internal grants. Alan Schreiber asked if there was a down side to all of this. Kurt Volker responded that he would recommend asking for \$1.5 million. Alan Schreiber added that even if the funding had not been cut, inflation would have reduced the amount that was available for funding. Alan Schreiber asked the commissioners if the Commission wanted to increase the scope of the enabling legislation. Alan Schreiber continued saying that new technologies for harvest and new issues have created new avenues of research. Implementation of sustainable practices for specialty crops was an issue. Costs of tuitions have also increased. Doug Walsh added that the increase in bio-fuels will also change the environment.

Kurt Volker moved that the administrator and the executive committee prepare a proposal for review to increase funding to \$1.5 million. Work would be done in conjunction with WSU in approaching the legislature. Jay Schafer seconded the motion.

Ben Barstow asked whether or not breeding for resistance or to a specific end would be considered to be a part. Alan Schreiber said that that would be up to the Commission. Ann George said that she wanted to publicly state the intention of the Dean to give attention to the Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration and his invitation to be a part of the issue.

The motion passed unanimously.

Pesticide Notification Network

Catherine Daniels and Jane Thomas

Chuck Masters said that, in the future, it was important to have the proposal in front of the commissioners prior to the meeting. There had been significant frustration that questions were both unasked and unanswered. Chair Masters offered his thanks on behalf of the Commission that they had made the effort to attend this meeting to answer questions.

Catherine Daniels apologized to the commissioners and said that a schedule change had resulted in the proposal not being in front of the commissioners prior to its presentation.

Catherine Daniels said that she would make the presentation again with the proposal now in everyone's hands. Catherine Daniels asked for input on how best to do this in the future. The commissioners did not feel that they needed to hear the progress report again so the proposal was presented. It was reported that \$1996.67 will be refunded to the WSCPR by the PNN. It had been known earlier that there would be a refund but the amount is generally not known until mid July. Expenses were explained. Byron Phillips asked questions regarding salaries. Ben Barstow said that he was troubled by the fact that Oregon did not contribute to PNN but derived benefits from it. Jane Thomas replied that she does not send notifications to Oregon only the SLN's were posted. Erik Johansen said that the increase in the funds for PNN was a good argument to put before the legislature to increase WSCPR funding. Doug Walsh said that it was important for the commissioners to remember that PNN had started out as only a webpage and now has thousands of transmissions. It has been a good investment in the ten years. Byron Phillips asked for more information regarding what is done for the \$57,000. Jane Thomas explained what all is done at PNN.

Chuck Masters said that the question had been posed earlier as to what should be done in the future. This issue needs to be addressed at the March meeting and it would be good to see the submission of the proposal made 30 days in advance just like other proposals.

Jane Thomas requested that a line in the minutes be removed due to inaccuracy. The fifth line on page 4 would be removed.

Ann George moved that the PNN be treated as a proposal and be submitted 30 day prior to the March meeting and voted on that day. Jay Schafer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. There were no abstentions.

Ann George moved to adjourn. Byron Phillips seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 pm.