

Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration

March 16, 2006

Washington Potato Commission Offices
Moses Lake, Washington

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:07 am by Chair Kurt Volker.

Introductions/Public Comments/Minutes

Introductions were made by all present.

There were no public comments.

Chair Volker called for a motion to approve the minutes. The correct spelling for Pennbotec was given. Bill Mason gave spelling corrections.

Byron Phillips moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ben Barstow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Financial Report

Kurt Volker gave an introduction to the report. Chair Volker asked the minutes to reflect the appreciation that the Commission felt towards Dr. Alan Schreiber and Agriculture Development Group, Inc. Chair Volker said that great diligence had been taken by Alan Schreiber to be forthcoming with information and any possible concerns or problems that might have arisen. The Commission is thankful for Alan's work and communication throughout a difficult time keeping the concerns and well being of WSCPR as a highest priority.

Chair Volker said that after the financial report the Commission could discuss safeguards that are in place or which may be implemented.

Alan Schreiber handed out a message from the accountants' office conducting an investigation of the embezzlement case involving Alan Schreiber's business Agriculture Development Group, Inc. Alan Schreiber gave an overview of events as they have transpired since the last meeting. An explanation of the embezzlement was given. It was explained that the money began to disappear as soon as the suspect began work in 2003. The possibility that all information could be evidence in a trial slowed down the process of investigation and accounting examination to some extent. The time period involved has increased from one year to two and one-half years. Alan Schreiber explained that there was no financial statement at this time because the accounting office had such a difficult time understanding the relationship between WSU and WSCPR and the overall finances of the WSCPR. Alan Schreiber explained some of the problems that had arisen which have contributed to the length of time being taken to complete the investigation. Any criminal prosecution will not proceed until the accountants' investigation is completed.

Alan Schreiber explained the record keeping suggestions and how they could impact this commission. Discussion took place regarding the use of the Pasco account and the use of the Commission credit card. Kurt Volker asked for suggestions or comments. There would be continuation of the bi-monthly audit of the checking account and Visa bill by the WSCPR Treasurer in addition to 2-party signature checks.

Alan Schreiber wrote figures on the board to show the commissioners the status of the fund allocation.

Administrative

The WSCPR business for this period has been fairly routine. There have been extension requests and contracts to monitor. There has been only one problem and that has been the proposal involving high plains disease. In conversations with growers and processors as well as researchers it became apparent that the problem is larger than was communicated to the commissioners at the January meeting.

Alan Schreiber gave an update on the Pest Management Tour on the Eastside in 2006. It will be much the same as the Tour that was done in 2004. That Tour was very successful but everything can be improved. Alan Schreiber asked for input on possible stops or issues to address.

Doug Walsh suggested a stop at the ornamental nursery Northwest Horticulture. Jay Schafer asked if there was a conflict with the spinach seed conference. Kurt Volker suggested the Qualls Agriculture Laboratory and their work with environmental monitoring and drift studies. Alan Schreiber asked the Chair for a motion of support in the event that money for the Tour would be necessary prior to the beginning of FY07.

Ann George moved to allow work to commence for organization of the Pest Management Tour and incurring pre-Tour expenses. Byron Phillips seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Bill Mason asked about how much time would be available prior to setting the Tour agenda. He was interested in contributing to the Tour in some way. Cholinesterase testing and public health information might be interesting topics that could be delivered on the bus at various points in time.

Ann George added that Jerry Baron, who is taking over for Bob Holm from IR-4, is often on the West Coast and might be willing to come on the Tour. Todd Scholtz is quite active in CLC and is in the area and might be willing to come and give a talk.

Erik Johansen suggested having Jim Cowles contribute to the salmon buffers stop. Jim Cowles could speak about water sampling and pesticide monitoring. Ted Maxwell added that last year was the last year of a three year monitoring project.

Kurt Volker suggested that if the attendee list was quite similar to the last year's then it would be important that the stops were different. Alan Schreiber replied that every attempt was made that attendees did not come back for a return visit to the same side of the state.

Guest Speaker: David Granastein

David Granastein gave a presentation on organic farming in Washington State. Information can be gathered at <http://organicfarming.wsu.edu>

Kurt Volker thanked David Granastein for his presentation, adding that organic and conventional agriculture should not be considered as being in opposition to each other. David Granastein said that his goal was sustainability.

Lunch 12:23

Research Proposals

George Clough
High Plains Disease

This virus is relatively new to the North America and is very new to this area. This viral disease attacks sweet corn, field corn, pop corn and is hosted in wheat, small grains and grasses. It first showed up in 2002 in the Columbia Basin. The disease is spread by mite feeding. The mites follow the green bridge, develop and over-winter on wheat and as the wheat matures, they move to corn..

At this time there is no chemical control that is registered. Research is needed to ascertain extent of damage to sweet corn and what can be done to control it. Damage symptomology was explained.

Bernie O'Neal, a processor, spoke in support of funding the research on this disease.

Ann George asked what has been done in the Midwest to address the infestation there. There is some work being done with treatments but the main strategy is varietal resistance.

Alan Schreiber asked for an estimated number of acres involved. Simplot has 12,500 acres of which 1250 acres are infected. It is also expected that the coming year will be worse.

Dan Robinson asked about varieties. George Clough said that he had demonstrated that there is varietal resistance.

Byron Phillips asked for a dollar amount estimated loss from the disease. Dan Robinson said that he had the disease in every field but did not believe that he could quantify a loss amount. Bernie O'Neal said that he believed that in the Pasco area he lost 1 and ½ tons to the acre to the disease.

Chuck Masters asked if the planting dates and the varieties were the only research being done. George Clough said that he would be testing 20 varieties to evaluate them at the research station and also at two sites in the upper Basin around Othello.

Chuck Masters asked about the replication of the trials and about the trial design.

Kurt Volker asked for clarification of the locations of the various trials. There will be two variety resistance trials in the upper Basin. There will be one variety resistance trial in Hermiston. The planting date trial will be in the upper Basin. There will be a trial that is sampled at regular intervals in Hermiston in order to establish time of infection with amount of loss. Kurt Volker asked if funding had been received from the Oregon Processed Vegetable Association. Alan Schreiber replied that he had spoken with the organization and had been told that it had been ranked as a high priority. It has been recommended for funding.

Alan Schreiber asked for input from George Clough regarding financial support of this project relative to the size of the industry within the states. George Clough said that Oregon had between 8 and 10,000 acres. Washington had 95,000 acres at risk. The state of Washington stood to lose a great deal more than Oregon. The Oregon Processed Vegetable Association wanted to solve the problem before it got to the Willamette Valley.

Chuck Masters asked about planting dates. The question was whether or not the interaction of planting date and variety would affect the trial.

Andy Jensen asked for clarification regarding the plant age evaluation. This trial would have to rely on a constant level of inoculation. The green bridge theory came out of the Midwest. Chuck Masters followed up this issue and asked whether or not there would be enough applications for something this variable.

Ben Barstow asked about PCR testing. There would be PCR testing but it is too costly to do on all plants. Ben Barstow also asked about replications of planting dates at each location. There would not be replications of planting dates at one location.

Dr. Alan Schreiber

Book on Washington Agriculture

Erik Johansen handed out a memo from the Washington State Department of Agriculture detailing its proposed contribution to this proposal.

This is a commission project as opposed to a WSU or outside project. This proposal was tabled the first time that it was presented to the WSCPR. Significant demands were expected on the Commission money and there was concern about matching funds. The second time that it came before the Commission there was a communication from the Attorneys General office that raised some issues and created doubts. Upon further investigation, it became clear that the AG office was just making sure that a contract for Alan Schreiber would not be managed by Alan Schreiber. This was not a significant problem due to the fact that this policy is already in place. Since the last WSCPR meeting, there have been conversations among WSCPR staff, Erik Johansen and the Washington State Department of Agriculture. As a result of these conversations there have been some changes made to the proposal. WSDA is very supportive of this proposal and is willing to make a significant contribution in terms of existing work which would fit into the framework of this project. WSDA is willing to contribute 0.5 FTE with salary and benefits. WSDA would like to see the project expanded to include pesticide usage data. The usage data was not going to be included previously due to the amount of time it would take to amass the information. Now information can be included regarding what is used and how much.

Ted Maxwell said that the work had been chemical driven and now with this as a possibility the department could get back to doing other things. There would be good coordination and common goals. There were already people within the WSDA who were doing some part of this information gathering.

Andy Jensen asked how the WSDA gathered the information. The WSDA talked to commodity groups and growers. It will be in some part an estimate. Andy Jensen asked if the plan was still to do sections for seven crops a month.

Jane Thomas asked where this would be posted. It will be posted on the WSCPR web page.

Byron Phillips asked if there would be a problem with confidentiality. Erik Johansen replied that this was public information.

Ben Barstow asked about the policy requiring each proposal to originate with a user group. Alan Schreiber replied that this proposal was written on a form that it did not easily fit into. The submission form was designed for a different sort of research proposal. This proposal is not coming from any one commodity group. Erik Johansen said that this would be very valuable to EPA. Jane Thomas said that it would be very usable. The ease of use would be very important.

Kurt Volker commented that he felt that there was very little information to be included that could not be found on the internet already. Kurt Volker had concerns regarding ongoing funding and how great a need there really was for information on minor minor crops.

Ann George asked about staff time. Alan Schreiber said that the staff had been split with the financial investigation but it is wrapping up. It will take some time to get up to full speed but that will not be achieved until after the end of March.

Jane Thomas asked if there would be a key word search. There will be key word search on crop, pesticide and pest.

Alan Schreiber said that his feeling is that if the information site is as valuable as is expected then the upkeep will be undertaken by some entity.

Ben Barstow said that this was a long term outlay of resources. Alan Schreiber replied that was the case only if the Commission wished it to be. Erik Johansen added that WSDA was only committing for one year.

Burrowing Shrimp Issues Update – Art Losey

Art Losey reported on the Burrowing Shrimp Symposium in Long Beach, WA. Art Losey said that he wanted to applaud Washington State University for the highly interactive research workshop. There was standing room only.

Sandra Ristow contributed information regarding shrimp species, effective parasites and possible problems with intermediate hosts. Sandra reported on the international experts that had come to give information to the workshop. Art Losey said that he was sorry that there were no research papers handed out.

There was a discussion regarding sturgeon and sardines.

Information was generated on injective applications of carbaryl and for lower rates. Erik Johansen said that he would be willing to look at a 24C for this use if the data supported it.

Art Losey said that he had come away with a much more enthusiastic frame of mind and a supportive attitude. Art Losey said that one woman stood up saying she felt that there was a need to put more pressure on the Toxics Coalition to contribute the support which they said that they would do.

Spartina is a success story. There was not as much political problem with spartina and the people involved had learned a lot from the burrowing shrimp issue. Art Losey said that he was excited about all of the research that had been generated. Sandra Ristow commented on all of the information that Kim Patten and others had generated, some of which with WSCPR support.

Art Losey said that he really hoped that WSU would do this again.

Pesticide Notification Network Report and Funding Request

Jane Thomas gave the report on PNN. Jane Thomas is the coordinator and has been with the project since it was created by Alan Schreiber. It is part of the charter of the WSCPR. It is an

information system that distributes information that is collected on pesticide registration activity during the past year. There are different notification lists depending on the information associated with the recipient of the information. Different situations that had called for the use of the system were listed and explained.

This was the year for a quadrennial PNN survey. All notifications and surveys are done online. This survey generated a smaller response than in previous years. 82% of the 28% who responded said that the network was useful. Many of the users said that they in turn distribute the information also.

Last year the budget was not an accurate reflection of allotments. The costs of the benefits and the required increase by WSU were not correctly figured. There was also a reworking of a clerk's position.

Chuck Masters asked for clarification on budget expenditures. Jane Thomas explained the differences from the budget last year.

Alan Schreiber asked if WSU required PNN to factor in a 4% raise that was not received then that should mean that there would be money coming back to the Commission. Doug Walsh explained the process that WSU used.

Proposal Discussion

Alan Schreiber went to board to show the scores given the two research proposals. The scores for proposal 06AN033 were 67, 75, 82, 76, 75, 75, 75 giving an average score of 72 points. The scores for proposal 06AN011 were 80, 80, 78, 73, 80, 40, 91 giving an average score of 76.8.

Kurt Volker opened discussion on proposal 06AN033 High Plains Disease.

Art Losey moved to approve the proposal for High Plains Disease. Ann George seconded the motion.

Chair Volker called for discussion.

Ben Barstow said that there would be no statistically valid information obtained from the planting data. There are no replications. Ben suggested that the proposal be funded at one half level to cover the cost of the variety screening. Kurt Volker and Byron Phillips agreed with that assessment.

Chuck Masters said that when he first had read the proposal he felt that there was a good design. Then he felt that it was misleading and that the interaction between random planting dates and varietal differences had to be accounted for. He was left with the distinct impression that although this was a significant issue the design of the project had not be thoroughly thought through to come up with a good plan. Chuck Masters said that he would have a hard time supporting this proposal.

Kurt Volker said that he felt that the design was flawed. The Commission has seen three different people but all have given the same proposal. There were no changes made to respond to previous concerns.

Alan Schreiber said that the pest issue is a big problem. He wondered if it would not be better to give conditional approval. Approval could be given until the methodological concerns were addressed if it was agreed that this was a serious problem. It would be unfortunate to penalize the industry.

Andy Jensen asked who would get the money. The money would go to OSU and Phil Hamm. Mark Trent is listed as the principal investigator. OSU will incur the costs and setting up the plots. Mark Trent will add information with little cost.

Dan Robinson was not impressed with the proposal when it was made in Portland. He disagreed with Bernie regarding crop loss. Dan Robinson then spoke with other growers in the area and felt that research did need to be undertaken for this pest. This research is too simple.

Chuck Masters said that the proposal is just sloppy.

Kurt Volker said that the presentation given verbally did not agree with the proposal as submitted in written form. The statistics to be gathered do not match what they indicated.

Byron Phillips questioned the significance of the data as it would be collected.

Andy Jensen felt that there needed to be more work done on vector biology.

The question was called for.

There were two votes yes. There were 8 votes nay. The motion did not carry.

Ann George moved to fund the proposal at 75%. Three varietal resistance trials would be funded two in Hermiston and one in Washington. The proposal needs to be rewritten to accurately reflect the number and location of the trials. Erik Johansen seconded the motion.

There will not be a planting date trial.

Doug Walsh asked how this is different from varietal development. Ben Barstow agreed that this project was varietal development. Alan Schreiber said that this was not breeding or development but screening for specific disease resistance.

Chuck Masters reminded the commissioners that, according to the presenters, gaining HPD resistance would cost smut resistance. Alan Schreiber said that that was a very preliminary anecdotal observation.

Byron Phillips asked if the rewriting would be done before or after the approval if given.

Dan Robinson said that he hated to turn down research. Different varieties are planted for different times to avoid disease. Ann George asked Dan Robinson what part of this proposal seemed the most important to him. Dan replied that the varietal screening was most important.

The question was called for. The proposal would be funded at \$7650 and rewritten.

There were 6 votes for funding. There were 4 votes against funding. The motion carried.

Chair Volker asked for a motion on the Washington Agriculture Handbook.

Art Losey moved to accept the proposal. Jay Schafer seconded the motion.

Discussion followed.

Andy Jensen suggested that there should be benchmarks established in the contract. Alan Schreiber said that there could be a report given at each meeting. It was important to remember though that this project would be quite transparent. Each section would be open for review as it was posted on the website. The contract could also be written with a 30 day severance portion.

Chuck Masters said that he felt that the benefit was significant and would contribute greatly to understanding. He did have concerns who should shoulder the burden of the funding.

Ann George said that this would be a great resource but is concerned about the Commission being the proprietor. She had concerns if Alan decided not to move forward with this project. Ann George wondered if it would be better housed in some other fashion. Erik Johansen said that where it is posted is not as important as whether or not to fund the project.

Discussion followed as to the relative benefits with WSCPR, WSDA, and WSU.

Art Losey asked Alan Schreiber if he had a plan B if he could not do it. Doug Walsh would take over the project.

The question was called for.

There were 8 votes in favor. There were 2 votes against. The motion carried.

Ann George asked that Byron Phillip's proposal recommendations be on the next agenda.

Dan Robinson asked about the man at the Portland meeting who seemed to be having a heart attack during his presentation to the WSCPR. Alan Schreiber said that he was fine.

Setting Meeting Dates and Locations

May 10th, Snoqualmie Pass

July 12th (a Wednesday) in the Tri Cities

September Virtual Meeting, Tuesday the 19th

Bill Mason moved to adjourn the meeting. Ben Barstow seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Kurt Volker, Chair

Alan Schreiber, Executive Administrator