

WASHINGTON STATE COMMISSION
ON
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION

January 8 and 9, 2008

University of Oregon Portland Center
Portland, OR

Charles J. Masters, Chair, presiding

Approved Minutes

Commissioners present: Rick Hamman, Doug Walsh, Alan Schreiber, Art Losey, Bob Berger, Bryan Sakuma, Andy Jensen, Chuck Masters, Byron Phillips, Ben Barstow, Jay Schafer, Trent Munden, Kelly McLain, and Erik Johansen

Administration staff present: Alan Schreiber, Laurie Wishkoski, and Erin Gwinn.

Chair Masters called the meeting to order at 1:01pm.

Minutes

Chair Masters asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from the November meeting. Andy Jensen stated that on page 2 in reference to his motion Andy Jensen would like it to read that he moved to accept the financial report. Jensen noted that on Page 6 “for” was misspelled “fro” and that project 7 on page 9 had a sentence that should be reworded for better clarity. Doug Walsh noted that his name was misspelled Dough.

Andy Jensen moved to accept the minutes with proposed corrections. Kurt Volker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Financial report

Alan Schreiber went over the financial report and explained that overall the commission was within budget with the exception of the Tour. All items were explained. Several commissioners

posed questions about the check detail, especially regarding check 1521. The financial report was tabled in order to give the administrator a chance to get more information.

An update sheet on the Washington Ag Project was handed out.

Alan Schreiber explained the report notations on the Washington Ag Project, he also went over the numbers that have been completed and those that are planned. Andy Jensen asked about livestock being listed. Schreiber said that they did have pests and use pesticides and resources permitted including animal crops.

Alan Schreiber presented a draft of the Biennial Report. It was also explained that future awards would not be given to project proposals until all past grant reports have been submitted. Alan Schreiber asked for suggestions on the showcase report, discussion ensued. Commissioners were asked to give feedback and corrections as the report draft was being passed around.

Alan Schreiber went over the money that is available for funding. Schreiber noted that there is less money than was indicated by WSU at the November meeting. Bob Berger asked if there is a reserve fund for emergencies. Alan explained how reserve funds were allocated.

Proposals

08AN031 Dennis Johnson Potato/Black Dot

Potato black dot is difficult to evaluate because symptoms are latent, while infection occurs early in the plant's life cycle. The project will involve evaluation of efficacy on black dot using new assay technique. The project will focus on the infection above ground, but below ground is also a serious issue. Johnson explained the experimental methodology that would be used in the proposed efficacy trials. The project hopes to develop an IPM strategy for all major diseases using the lowest amount of chemicals.

Kurt Volker asked about commitment of support from registrant. Expect to get money from Syngenta, which that will be needed. Chuck Masters asked about application timing. Kurt Volker asked about seed treatment evaluations.

08PN032 Alan Schreiber Organic Sweet Corn/Earworm

Alec McErlich presenting

Corn earworm has been a problem since organic sweet corn production began in Eastern Washington. Due to a large increase of organic acreage, organic sweet corn now represents 10% of sweet corn production in state. The newer varieties of sweet corn are more susceptible to corn earworm. Corn earworm creates not only feeding damage, but also staining and possible secondary fungal infections from leakage. This leads to increased sorting and higher cost.

Art Losey asked for any information as to degree of toxicity of the proposed pesticides on bees. These products are less toxic than those used on conventional sweet corn. Art Losey said that this was a large issue, as bees are highly attracted to sweet corn pollen. Spinosad, which will be tested, is only toxic until it dries. Andy Jensen asked for clarification on treatment list, timings, and trappings. Bob Berger asked about the item 6 Health concerns explanations. Alan Schreiber

said that beliefs may not be universally held that organic is a healthier food source, but there are people that hold this belief. Bob Berger asked about proprietary information. Doug Walsh asked about treatment levels and cumulative amounts of pesticides.

08AN001R David Gent Hops/Powdery Mildew

This study will develop a model with practical applications and use quantified effects to educate growers on decision making for powdery mildew in hops. The researchers have inherited 241 data sets they will use to study infection levels and economic thresholds. They expect to have a preliminary model and quantitative data set in 2009.

Bob Berger asked about the budget with expenditures for 18 months. Alan Schreiber explained the form is for 18 months, however, some projects require more than 18 months to complete. Bob Berger stated that Note 1 on project budget is an abbreviation for overhead and noted that the commission doesn't pay overhead. Gent responded that this is an error and should actually be fringe benefits. Byron Phillips asked about risk involved in the project. Modeling is difficult; the researchers are dependent on information from growers' fields. Modeling powdery mildew is always a high-risk project, however, if we don't publish a model for growers there will be no standard. Andy Jensen asked about matching funds from the Hop industry. These funds are pending.

08AN002R David Gent Hops/Spider Mites

This project was previously funded in 2005. This project will quantify the effect of programs to bio-control mites using sulfur specifically. The first project illuminated the problem of spider mites in hops; this project will find out whether this is a practical issue for growers. The outcomes will be completed in 2009. This project will give a guideline for timings of sulfur that should be avoided by growers. There will be joint funding with the USDA.

Rick Hamman asked about David Gent's proposals having the highest cost for employee benefits. Byron Phillips stated that it is expensive to give benefits to a lower income fulltime, this works against them. Gent referenced web address where these numbers could be verified. Doug Walsh noted that this has been previously studied very thoroughly in wine grapes and tree fruit. There is other literature that describes problem; this project will ask what we should do about this problem in hops specifically with the canopy. Current recommendation says don't use sulfur; this is not practical for growers. Kurt Volker asked about stated 10 applications of fungicide and whether this applied to Washington or the Willamette. Gent stated the average in the Willamette is 6 sprays, but in Washington is up to 12 sprays. Kurt Volker asked for clarification of the budget. Doug Walsh explained that this is tedious project; there are temporary workers but also two staff supervisors.

08PN037 Lindsey duToit Carrot/Powdery Mildew

This project is the third year of ongoing research involving powdery mildew and carrot seed production. The difficulty growers face is knowing when to treat for powdery mildew, as in the past growers did not spray for powdery mildew after July. This study is looking at whether or not spray should be stopped after July. The results have been surprising compared to what growers had originally thought. This project has implications for carrot seed growers and for the type of applications used for powdery mildew, especially with aerial spray.

Kurt Volker asked if this would be the last year for the research. du Toit stated that this would be the last year as proposed, but that there is room for ongoing research.

08AN036 Rick Boydston Vegetables/Mulch weed control

This proposal plans to test five different biodegradable plastic mulches used in watermelon and peppers. The study will evaluate performance on west and east side. The study will test different mulches as variables with black plastic standard as a control.

Rick Hamman asked about budget and price of mulches. Boydston stated that cost is high, but research is needed. Kurt Volker asked about the previously tested, ineffective mulches, asked requested justification for testing these again. Boydston replied that these had not been tried on the east side of the mountains. Bob Berger asked about clarification on the in-kind match: Note 2, this was a cut and paste error. Byron Phillips asked for clarification on not recycling materials, grower present stated that they try but recycling will never take product.

08PN047 Lynell Tanigoshi Potato/Flea Beetle

This proposal is requesting a second year of funding for a proposed three year project. This is a study for an IPM technique, looking at traditional and new strategies, to control flea beetle. Last year, the researchers performed detailed bioassays of potato leaves to revisit efficacy and look at several different chemistries. This year, they will be testing new chemicals. This project will look at new combinations and timings of registered insecticides. Growers surveyed are only using a small cluster of insecticides available. The study will do disruptive sampling to see where the tubers are at along with what's in the soil, as flea beetles are multigenerational and have generational overlap. Objectives are similar to last year, but commercial plots will be expanded.

Kurt Volker asked if they could contrast between nearby organic field and research center. Tanigoshi said that you could visibly see the beetles moving across the field, but assumes that they had a protected niche, whereas the research areas were clean fields.

08AN042 Tessa Grasswitz Hops/Ground Cover

This proposal will study four core species of annuals for cover crops. Mowing will move beneficials into the hop canopy. The study will have both autumn and spring plantings and will look at self seeding rather than having to reseed.

Rick Hamman asked how many times a grower might mow. This is highly dependent on the individual growing operation. More success has been seen with hops than has previously been had in wine grapes. Bob Berger asked for clarification on mowing as a method of moving beneficials into canopy. Andy Jensen asked if the prey available in the ground cover had been assessed. Ben Barstow asked about mowing protocols. Byron Phillips asked whether or not there was monitoring for beneficial movement at night. Kurt Volker asked how long the project was going to keep going and whether or not data on planting dates already existed. Chuck Masters asked about amount of beneficial movement need to see success in crop.

08AN043 Tessa Grasswitz Hop Looper

This is the last year of research for this proposal. Researchers have identified 9 different parasitoids on the hop looper. There is a need to do more research on late season data, as it is unknown whether predators may be more important than parasites. The experimental trap designs need to be modified to demonstrate field attraction.

Andy Jensen commented that vespids would not behave normally when in a trap with a potted plant, especially after having been trapped and relocated.

08AN049 Vince Hebert Potato/Fumigant

This study hopes to help establish buffer zones to reduce fumigant off-gassing of MITC. All the information currently used to generate data is from CA, with no Pacific Northwest or regional studies to provide government agencies with the best buffer zone criteria. The study would use many application techniques, not just fumigation, including center pivot chemigation and others as outlined in the proposal to provide flux measurements. The study would be performed with both off field and on field examinations in, potentially, four fields.

Bob Berger asked about ownership of center pivot, as we would be paying for the retrofitting. Alan Schreiber and Kurt Volker discussed this issue, Hebert clarified that equipment cost was only approx. \$700, the rest is labor. Discussion ensued about importance of this topic and necessary emissions data for the Pacific NW, also the implications this holds with the EPA and whether buffer zones actually work. Chair Masters asked whether treatment would be in separate circles. Chair Masters asked about irrigation, Hebert said that the lap time is a factor and also the irrigation cut off date.

08PN048 Vince Hebert Potato/Fumigant

This proposal is for an efficacy study using strategies for shank, fumigation, and other reduced emission technologies to see whether these techniques are working. There are further implications for these applications and they would benefit many groups of individuals. The study will look at application, yield quality, and plant assays. The study will work with the grower community, field men, and registrants. The study is needed for the grower community to show if the strategies are effective and will work in tandem with Hebert's flux studies. Eventually efficacy data would be worked into a pamphlet to educate.

Cynthia Lopez was asked for her opinion; she stated that this is an important issue and that drift is one of the largest issues and that there have been several significant incidents. The possibility for drift increasing was discussed. Art Losey stated that he felt this needed to be coupled with grower education, as well as an application method that will keep the product from drifting. Chair Masters asked about Sullivan providing possible equipment. They may provide some equipment. The EPA is very interested in the information that comes from the project for setting up regulatory standards.

08AN051 Gary Grove Cherry/Powdery Mildew

This study will provide a model to growers for what to apply at specific times in reference to cherry powdery mildew. The project will take a look at new fungicides that have been registered for use with powdery mildew and their effects at different times of plant and disease development. Testing will occur to see what treatment is best during different periods of the

powdery mildew life cycle. Model specific disease recommendations will be available via the Internet, which will help to advise growers of what applications should be used in which situations.

Rick Hamman asked about sensitivity of the testing device. The device is very sensitive relative to the amount of spores in one colony. Cynthia Lopez asked about accessibility of the information and whether it would be used. Based on the AgWeatherNet cherry weather site traffic, it would be widely used. Chair Masters asked about cash match. Grove stated that he had already received his funding.

08PN035 Alan Schreiber Asparagus/Organic Pest Management

There is a lot of interest and demand for organic asparagus, but there has not historically been a crop that growers are interested in due to European Asparagus aphid pests. The study will be an efficacy trial for pesticides on European Asparagus aphid, including newly registered pesticides and Byron Phillips' suggestion of Surround. The other trial will be an herbicide trial using new organic herbicides. There are both environmental and economic implications for this project.

Cynthia Lopez asked about the human health aspect. This is an aphid that does not have a reaction to many pesticides. Andy Jensen asked if growers checked for aphids and sprayed in response to findings. Alan Schreiber said that there are penalties for not spraying in response to aphids on plants.

08AN046 Pat Falco Organics/Oilseed Meals

Kevin Fullerton presenting

This project is a more holistic look at how *Brassica juncea* meal is effective in pest control when added to existing fields and will give guidelines on how to use brassica meal. Currently it is uncertain which meals will be used for bio-fuels and there is research necessary to see what the value of the product will be. *Sinapis alba* will also be studied for efficacy in cooperation with data from U of I. *B. juncea* is currently being used as a rotation crop with potatoes, but the meal could be an alternative.

Jay Schafer stated that when you were using meal you would have to assay the seed and also make sure that all seed are dead to avoid contamination. Schafer noted that just saying *S. alba* or *B. juncea* is not specific enough. Fullerton stated that they would be using the *S. alba* that U of I had been using. Byron Phillips asked about whether or not the meal would contain residues. This raised questions as to whether or not carryover residues would be a problem and whether they would need organic meal. Byron Phillips asked why there was no co-funding from wine grape industry. The wine grape industry is aware that research is being done, but as of yet, has not offered to co-fund. Byron Phillips questioned rental of plots in Prosser. Rick Hamman asked whether the project was being over ambitious. Fullerton stated that this was possible. Fullerton said that the cost effectiveness of the crop will have to be determined and this will take a lot of time and energy.

Meeting Adjourned 5:10pm.

January 9, 2008

Commissioners and representatives present: Chair Masters, Andy Jensen, Bryan Sakuma, Bob Berger, Doug Walsh, Erik Johansen, Kelly McLain, Trent Munden, Ben Barstow, Rick Hamman, Art Losey, Byron Phillips, Alan Schreiber, Jay Schafer, Kurt Volker, and Pam Edwards

Administration present: Alan Schreiber, Laurie Wishkoski, Erin Gwinn, Cynthia Lopez

Absent: Ann George

Guest: Pete Jacoby

Meeting called to order at 8:03am.

Legislative Agenda

Alan Schreiber passed out WSU's "Emerging Global Animal Health & Agriculture Issues". The initiative will provide \$250,000 funding to WSCPR. Currently the outcome is unknown. Pete Jacoby added that they are continuing to try and update extension research centers. He asked for cooperation in supporting programs, especially in Prosser where the programs are suffering. Alan Schreiber said that at this point this is a purely fiscal legislation and that it is possible that the legislature and Office of Financial Management could interpret the document differently.

Chair Masters asked about changing the name of the WSCPR. Alan Schreiber said that this is difficult because you have to find a sponsor for the name change. This has not been done to avoid overexposure of the group and draw unnecessary attention. Alan Schreiber suggested that if this is a step that is going to be made we should use Senator Bill Grant from Walla Walla. Ben Barstow was concerned because if you change the name in the legislature it is possible to change everything in the commission legislation as well. Andy Jensen talked to lobbyist Jim Jesernig, who felt this was a safe step with a narrow enough bill title. Chair Masters stated that the name change requested had been Washington State Commission on Integrated Pest Management. Jay Schafer suggested that the commission should drop "integrated". Bob Berger stated that "integrated" needed to be in the name because its meaning is in statute. Kelly McLain stated that Integrated Pest Management was often targeted. Alan Schreiber suggested that we run it by our legislators. Erik Johansen suggested that we send a new description of what the commission does to the governor's office that way descriptions in the news blurbs aren't so prejudicial to change perception. Discussion was tabled until after presentations in order to allow for adequate discussion time.

Financial Report

Alan Schreiber reported that Check 1521 was a check sent to WSU to reimburse the WSU WSCPR account from the Pasco WSCPR account. All other checks were detailed. Rick Hamman asked about the figures on a letter that Alan Schreiber had sent out in the WSCPR notebooks not matching the number shown yesterday. Alan Schreiber detailed an e-mail from WSU's Mike Petrusky which included a spreadsheet with a corrected budget. Alan Schreiber said that he had received an e-mail with the end of year reports which showed that there was more money in the end than had been projected because some unspent grant money had been pulled back.

Bob Berger moved to approve the financials. Byron Phillips seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

08AN045 Tom Walters Raspberry/Root Rot

Raspberry root rot limits life of raspberry plant, which cost over \$4000 per acre to replant. The study will see if you can control root rot by where you are placing your drip line. To date they have done trials in Puyallup and Mount Vernon, which have shown that the placement of drip line mounting does make a difference. They have gathered results through both cane weight and yields. They plan to perform second year yields and make more significant findings on the drip placement.

Jay Schafer asked if they had been using strobilurins previously. Walters said that they had not to his knowledge.

08PN050 Carl St Hiliare Lavender/Weeds

The project will be an efficacy trial for herbicides on lavender. Bob Berger asked about Surflan, which is labeled for ornamental lavender. Alan Schreiber said that the data was gathered from another source, but that they are looking for a product that they can get a registration in the next two years. Kurt Volker asked about the growth potential for lavender. Carl St. Hiliare stated that there is, based on the French market, but that data is scarce for the Washington. He stated that there could be other uses for lavender and that the market will depend on the varieties and types of lavender that prove to be profitable.

08AN028R Elizabeth Beers Apple/Woolly Aphid

Byron Phillips presenting

Woolly apple aphid is the #2 insect pest in apples and the #1 insect pest in many organic plots. The woolly apple aphid is a quarantine pest in many of our export countries. Some of the predators that apple growers rely on are decreasing in number and with the move away from harsher insecticides the woolly apple aphid is becoming a problem. Thiodan and diazinon are still used, but both pose problems and are not consistently effective. The study will also look at predator release.

Andy Jensen noted that all research was being done at the above ground and foliar areas, but wondered if they were looking at what was going on below the ground. Byron Phillips stated that biological control below the ground would be difficult. There are other studies that are looking this area. He also stated that the biology of the pest is changing and they are moving to an over-wintering above ground, including feeding on decaying fruit. Chair Masters asked about trial design. Byron Phillips said that is would be a block design where they would then take predators into the lab to assess fecundity.

08AN025R John Brown Poplar/Willow Borer

Doug Walsh Presenting

Poplar willow borer is one of the key pests especially as we shift away from pulp and into the board lumber industry where the willow borer degrades the hardwood. Several pesticides have been registered, but not with a focus on poplar willow borer. The first objective is to stop the degradation of the wood. The second objective is to look at the concentration of the neo-nicotinal

insecticides within the tree vascular tissues in the lab in an effort to control poplar willow borer at the smallest cost. Doug Walsh detailed that the cost to the commission would be for the labor of a graduate student. There is a large amount of financial cooperation through Greenwood Industries.

Rick Hamman asked about the significance of the willow borer. This was the primary pest and it causes trees to fall, which can be economically devastating to the crop. There is no good control method because timing is tricky and expensive with contact insecticide. Ben Barstow asked if the trees were susceptible throughout the life cycle. This is more common in younger trees, but trees are susceptible throughout the life cycle. Kurt Volker asked about the percentage of the industry in Washington. There are 4,000 acres with Greenwood and around 11,000 with Boise Cascade. Kurt Volker asked about Boise Cascade not providing co-funding. Doug Walsh stated that this had become difficult due to new owner, Office Max, who is more interested in the pulp industry. Bob Berger asked about whether legislature separated Ag and Timber. Alan Schreiber commented that it was in the top 20 products and is counted as a major crop.

08AN038 Kim Patten

Riparian Zone/Knotweed

This project deals with Knotweed control in Riparian zones. Previously researchers have tried to develop spray systems that will control knotweed, but they have not been that successful. Application methods have been changed and researchers want to try larger plots. The largest expenditure for this project is Patten's time. This is already paid for, therefore, the requested cost for this project is low.

Bob Berger mentioned that many years ago glyphosate applied at bloom was very effective. Kim said applications against Japanese knotweed with glyphosate was successful, but not against Bohemian knotweed. Kelly McLain stated that DOE has monitored streams following imazapyr applications and there have been zero detections. DOE has no problems with the applications made to knotweeds.

08PN039 Kim Patten

Shellfish/Burrowing Shrimp

This proposal is working to use imidacloprid for burrowing shrimp control in oyster production. This is proven to work on small plots, but they need to test it on a large scale. The study will also look at earlier season applications, applying product to eelgrass before it gets too tall, which interferes with broadcast application. Historically, there has been a problem with getting match from the industry. Match is being provided from state funds, with Booth's time and a boat being provided by the industry.

Kurt Volker asked about control of eelgrass; Patten replied that the state's opinion on eelgrass is beginning to change. For the EUP they are selecting sites and hope to make 1-2 acre sites in areas with potential application problems, look at replicated early season timing of application in areas with heavy eelgrass (ahead of plant growth), and a set of applications in areas with heavy eelgrass growth. There will also be replicated 10-acre plots with imidacloprid used in an aerial application. There will be large plots to look at drift and off target impacts.

08PN040 Kim Patten

Canals/Pond Weed

Sago pondweed is a major submersed aquatic weed in the Western United States. The study will look for alternatives to current control methods, including a series of herbicides like Habitat and Sonar. These were put into trials last year and they did not have a high level of control. This could have a billion dollar effect on control efforts in Eastern Washington. The researchers would like to get efficacy data; studies are not giving similar data to the preliminary chemical company data.

Byron Phillips asked about how this would occur on a large scale; Patten responded that it would be difficult, this is one of the largest concerns with the project. Ben Barstow asked about movement of product; Patten replied that there is some movement seen into adjacent areas, but not from plot to plot. Kelly McLain clarified that the project would apply dry and then irrigate. McLain asked if this was in multiple sites as Eastern Washington irrigation canals vastly differ from those on the west side; Patten replied that the test area would be in Benton City area due to restrictions on where this type of a study could take place, but that they were aware of the difference between Eastern Washington irrigation and others in the state. McLain noted that this is not the only study of this type; Patten added that most Western states have a similar project. Byron Phillips asked if there were human health issues concerned with xylene; McLain responded that there were many health issues including a death in Idaho and that there are also issues with acrolein.

08PN041 Kim Patten

Cranberry/Various Pests

This is a continuing project focusing on three pests. The first portion of this project is aimed at getting a registration for quinclorac for yellow weed in cranberry. They currently have marginal efficacy with quinclorac. They would like to find efficacy data on yellow weed across a range of conditions, including timing and effects. The second project looks at developing controls for black vine weevil. There is a 50% fecundity with current treatments. They would like to develop different baits, including beet. Finally, they would look at biorationals in controlling black headed fire worm. Researchers hope to use Delegate and among other insecticides. Co-funding comes from many other entities, including Ocean Spray.

Alan Schreiber asked about registrant for quinclorac. Andy Jensen asked about technique of chemigation in cranberries; Patten explained that you put out your sprinklers and inject product. You then time the sprinkler, generally using a dye, to time turning off the system. Patten noted that this causes a lot of wash off and that the current systems are not made for this type of application. Chair Masters asked about design of the project; Patten responded that he does 20-30 replications and that size depends on whether he is looking to use a larvicide or an adulticide.

08AN052 Wee Yee

Apple/Apple Maggots

This project is a study of volatile attractants in apple maggot. The apple maggot is a major quarantine factor in export markets. Studies show that the flies have expanded their range over the last 20 years. Ammonia-baited traps have been shown to be inferior through cases where they do not catch flies, but larvae cover the tree. The project is making comparisons to flies in the eastern United States as most volatiles studied are from the east and not the Pacific NW. Findings show that flies from the Pacific NW are not attracted to traditional lures developed in the eastern US. The researchers are trying to determine which variation of apple maggot exists in

queen society. The odorous house ant is a nuisance ant. We need to know which ants we have in Washington, which ants are damaging, and which ants are nuisance along with what we can do to control them.

Art Losey reported on the problems of misidentification and how important this information can be for educating inspectors. Odorous house ants are firmly established and can be found in undisturbed as well as disturbed areas. Doug Walsh asked about the possibility of working with a molecular biologist. Chair Masters asked about how the forage patterns and length of trials would be taken to make statistical data; Hansen said that it is not something that can be reduced to statistics and that the information is mainly biological. Ben Barstow asked about the expected end point of the project; Hansen explained that they were trying to survey every county in Washington.

08AN021R Hannu Pappu Onion/Iris Yellow Spot Virus

This proposal is the same as previously submitted in November, with the exception of now including higher matching funds. The study is looking at breaking the life cycle of the IYSV and identifying alternate hosts. Researchers intend to screen onion germplasm for the virus.

Alan Schreiber asked that Pappu talk about matching funds. Pappu stated that there would be matching funds from the Pacific Northwest Vegetable Association (PNVA), as there is no source of matching funds for the onion industry. Pappu stated that he had also asked the Columbia Basin Seed Growers Association, but they had not appropriated any funds. Byron Phillips thanked Pappu for gaining \$5,000 dollars in matching funds, but questioned why the proposal was \$5,000 more than the November submission. Pappu stated that there had been an addition to the project since the proposal had been submitted dealing with the germplasm screening. Pappu stated that the proposal as submitted was the same as its last submission, but that there had been research added to the project after the proposal had been submitted. Kurt Volker stated that if it the research was not in the proposal then, technically, the research had not been added. Alan Schreiber asked for clarification on where the funding was going. Doug Walsh stated that he would be getting funding from a separate grant, Pappu stated that distribution between himself and Rondon was yet to be worked out. Kurt Volker asked about travel funding and how that would be spent. Bob Berger questioned the expenditure plan on the proposal and stated that the budget year should be corrected to show 08/09.

Business Meeting

Chair Masters brought up issue of a commission name change. A show of hands was called for to see how many members would like a name change. Nine members were in favor of a name change. Six members were opposed.

Byron Phillips stated that right now the risks outweigh the benefits; Ben Barstow asked if there would ever be a better time. Doug Walsh asked what the commission was trying to achieve with a name change; Andy Jensen stated that he speaks with people regularly who read the RFP and don't feel that they are covered under the commission including organic growers. Andy Jensen explained that many people don't know what our commission does through the current name. Chair Masters stated that the word "Pesticides" has a stigma attached. Jay Schafer noted that the

commission may be more apt to get funding if the governor's office understood what the commission did by clarifying the name to one which better umbrellas sustainable and organic commodities. Chair Masters asked whether the commission's current legislation could become changed while performing a name change. Bob Berger explained the "scope of the legislation". Art Losey noted that the commission is less likely to have its legislation changed through a sponsor who is more powerful in their respective political party, such as Bill Grant. Pam Edwards stated that there would be a lesser chance of a change to the commission's legislation due to having a history of no past problems. Art Losey stated that the commission would have to be careful because their funding could be forced into projects pertaining only to IPM. Bob Berger stated how a name change could alert anti-pesticide individuals to try and push IPM to a point where pesticides were a last resort. Bob Berger reminded the commission about when the new mandate was sought and the issues that occurred. Kelly McLain explained that in the Department of Ecology many people do not understand or support the WSCPR, but would if they knew that we deal in IPM.

Ben Barstow asked whether Bill Grant would sponsor the name change. Alan Schreiber stated that the commission should only pursue a name change if it received a strong sponsor. Schreiber stated that if Senator Grant would sponsor the name change, this would have to be done soon as it is late in the season and if the decision was not made in a timely fashion the name change could be pushed until the next legislative session.

Discussion ensued that about name change and it was decided that name change could proceed as long as Bill Grant would sponsor the bill, that we would need to make sure that he could control said bill, and that the bill would need to be written to a scope so narrow that the bill would pertain to the name change only to avoid having our legislature changed.

Chair Masters asked for a show of hands favoring a name change. Chair Masters asked for a show of hands for those in favor of the name Washington State Commission on Integrated Pest Management. Eleven were in favor. Chair Masters asked for a show of hands for those in favor of the name Washington State Commission on Pest Management. Three were in favor.

Chair Masters asked for a motion regarding the name change.

Bob Berger moved to change the commission's name to Washington State Commission on Integrated Pest Management, on the condition that the commission is able to get a sponsor who can control the bill and that the bill would be written with a scope so narrow that it would pertain to the name change only. Erik Johansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Byron Phillips' funding analysis was passed out. Byron Phillips reviewed his fund analysis with the group. Chair Masters expressed his view that this was a useful tool in helping us to try and fund more quantitatively in the future. This could be combined with meeting our original mandate which states that 25% of our funding is to go to minor-minor crops. Alan Schreiber said that in preparing the biennial report the percentage of minor-minor crops is in a downward trend and that outreach would be needed to get more minor-minor proposals presented. Kelly McLain stated the importance of being careful in major-major crop proposal funding, where projects may

actually be too large. Byron Phillips noted that if we cut funding on major crops it is less likely to kill the project because of other funding sources, where this becomes a major issue for minor-minor crop proposals. Kurt Volker brought up linking other funding sources to our website for outreach. Alan Schreiber suggested that we change the RFP and state that we are looking for minor-minor crops. Doug Walsh brought up the problem of matching funds in minor-minor crops. Erik Johansen suggested we use the Washington Ag Project to target our outreach. Kurt Volker, in response to Doug Walsh, stated that the commission takes into account the more limited funds of the minor-minor crop proposals and the sources of their funding. Byron Phillips stated that historically the minor-minor projects tend to have a 1:1 match. Art Losey stated that many researchers are reluctant to apply for proposals without a match when funding mechanisms for that crop don't exist. Alan Schreiber reminded the group of the rhubarb emergency proposal that had been funded without any match and stated that this was not outside the realm of possibility. Chair Masters suggested that Byron's report should be used as a preparation tool and that this topic should be revisited in the March meeting. Bob Berger expressed concern in reducing the funding to a formula.

Chair Masters reported on his morning meeting with Cynthia Lopez. They reviewed the presentations for this afternoon and felt that there was merit in the Knotweed work and shellfish project, along with the Kim Patten's research on irrigation canals. The apple maggot works proposed by Yee and Laurel Hansen's proposals were also priorities. Lopez felt that the organic asparagus and lavender trials should not be funded. Kelly McLain reported that Cynthia Lopez was supporting proposals with a move away from stronger chemicals and proposals dealing with the metam sodium issue.

Scores for the proposals were shown to the group on the overhead projector; these were based on score sheets collected from the commissioners during the meeting. Alan Schreiber reviewed the spreadsheet showing money available for funding.

Comments were called for on all proposals.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN037. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN048. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN052. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN051. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN031. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN050. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN033. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN040. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN045. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN28R. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN038. Erik Johansen stated that he strongly supports Kim Patten's work on knotweed.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN049. No comments were spoken.

Andy Jensen stated that there were nine proposals submitted, which were also submitted to the Washington Potato Commission and that not all of these would be funded by the Potato Commission. Alan Schreiber stated that all proposal funding is subject to receiving their stated matching funds

Rick Hamman asked if a proposal did get matching funds, then would we fund; Alan Schreiber clarified that if the matching funds did not come in, then we did not fund. Kelly McLaine asked if they could find another match; Chair Masters and Alan Schreiber agreed that they could find another match.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN041. Jay Schafer was concerned that there are tests in this proposal which are lacking adequate description. Rick Hamman agreed. Ben Barstow said that he felt this as well, until he did the math. Kurt Volker suggested that in any funding letter we ask that he clarify the description of the project.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN034. Art Losey made a point that matching is from the Norm Ehman WSU fund while the other is from the PNW conference; there are two funding sources for this proposal.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN047. Ben Barstow said that this proposal tends to feel like continuing support for his program. Alan Schreiber clarified that it is not continuing support for his program because he has actually moved from small fruits to potatoes and has been relocated to WSU Mount Vernon.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN035. Art Losey asked about the amount of money requested. Alan Schreiber explained how the project is very labor intensive and that the application of the findings would be very broad, but that it would be a lot of work and that asparagus is an expensive commodity to deal with

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN043. No comments were spoken.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN025R. Byron Phillips stated that the commission has been funding IPM on poplars for 5 years and is concerned about requests for ongoing funding. Byron was also concerned about matching funds from the Nursery Association which weren't added to co-funding. The concern stemmed from clarification of the matching funds. Commissioners wondered whether upon receipt of these funds the project's budget would go down by \$10,000. Byron stated that a note should be made on any funding letter that states researchers should not rely on the commission to support in-house projects and to clarify the

budget and the co-funding. Kurt Volker noted that there are other people in this industry who are not contributing; the \$10,000 is referred to but is not part of the program. Volker suggested funding this project at \$10,000 less to wean them off the commission for a constant source of funding. Art Losey stated that they have come in every year with a new pest. Doug Walsh stated that that is actually how it is within the poplar industry, new pests emerge every year. He related that in terms of pesticide registration poplars are second only to alfalfa for number of pesticides registered. Erik Johansen stated that it seems like in reality every year there is a new pest in poplars and that they are doing quite a bit with poplars involving pesticide registration. Kurt Volker asked for the proposal to be flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN032. Trent Munden stated that the need for organic corn and organic ground is in great demand and that any research the commission can do on this topic would be beneficial. Art Losey asked about match of \$7,000 cash. Alan Schreiber stated that this money was coming from the sweet corn industry. They are confident that they will get at least \$3,000 from the registrant, in the event that this doesn't happen, they will ask for more funds from the sweet corn industry. In the event that they do not get the \$7,000 they will scale the project back..

Bob Berger asked about scaling back Alan's project and whether this option is offered to everyone. Alan Schreiber explained that generally if someone does not get their proposed match, the commission office works with them to negotiate and possibly scale back their research. Chair Masters asked for clarification on scaling back projects, specifically whether money could come back to us. Alan Schreiber explained that this normally doesn't happen, but that in some cases where all research funding is not used the money would come back to the commission.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN036. Byron Phillips stated that he felt this was an attempt to get a project funded by having someone else present it. Kurt Volker noted that the materials they want to test are the ones that have previously failed. The proposal was flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN039. Byron Phillips stated that he understands that this is an emergency situation and that there is co-funding, but that the industry is putting no money into this project, which is surprising for a \$40 million industry. Kelly McLain stated that most growers are spending up to \$150,000 per year to cover the permit with the Department of Ecology. Kelly McLain noted that there is a large cost to doing business in salt water. Byron Phillips noted that he saw this as a cost of doing business. Alan Schreiber added that we should put a caveat in the funding for this proposal that we must have a cash match in the future for this proposal. Chair Masters asked that this proposal be flagged and that the caveat be discussed later.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN042. Kurt Volker stated that this proposal is a duplication of projects that have been done in other similar crops. Kurt Volker questioned how much longer researchers would be performing these trials and felt that the project was being done too casually. Alan Schreiber said that this research program seems to submit the same proposal to five different commissions. Alan Schreiber stated that he felt it was a large amount of

money that would only affect a narrow set of problems. Chair Masters asked that the proposal be flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN021R. Byron Phillips observed that Hannu Pappu neither increased the scope of the project nor decreased the funding; Phillips suggested that we fund this proposal for \$5,000 less than requested. Jay Schafer noted that this is a devastating disease and that the proposal is economically important. The proposal was flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN002R. Byron Phillips was bothered by a lack of industry funds attached to this project. Kurt Volker noted that the benefit rate was high. Byron suggested that the commission fund at \$10,000. Rick Hamman, Kelly McLain, and Ben Barstow agreed that the amount was quite high. The proposal was flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN001R. Byron Phillips stated that models work well in tree fruit but that ROC analysis is very risky and most likely would not give them an accurate model. Kurt Volker stated that the presenter said that it would be very risky. The proposal was flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08PN044. Jay Schafer noted that there are at least 200,000 acres in Washington but that the commission was asked to contribute double the proposal's match. Ben Barstow stated that the Dry Pea & Lentil Commission's total research budget was \$60,000 and that much of this goes to other places. Ben Barstow also noted that half of the proposal's match comes from Idaho. Byron Phillips stated that it seems like an expensive project even though it would not be highly labor intensive. Kurt Volker commented that possibly it was just poorly written, as it was presented well. Jay Schafer commented that problem description was very descriptive, but that the project description was troublesome. Ben Barstow noted that most of the expenses were for travel between Walla Walla, Fairfield, and other research locations. The proposal was flagged for later discussion.

Chair Masters asked for comments on proposal #08AN046. Art Losey commented that 43% of the project dealt with wine grapes, but that there was no wine grape co-funding. Byron Phillips noted that it was troublesome to have to rent research land from ARS in Prosser. Byron did not feel that that the meal would be truly organic as the meals should not have residues. Chair Masters felt that the project description was loose and that the largest portion was disease assessment, but noted that there is no pathologist involved. Chair Masters felt that there were more people involved than actually required; he felt that this would not be the case if the proposal had been written by a qualified scientist. Kelly McLain stated that a salaried professor should not need compensation for salary. Erik Johansen had concerns with the numbers and that calculations did not add up correctly. Jay Schafer stated that the differences in the mustards that are used would cause cost differences.

Ben Barstow moved that proposal #08AN046 be denied funding due to a lack of clarity on the project design, lack of co-funding from the wine grape industry, and budget concerns. Byron Phillips seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Byron Phillips moved that proposal #08PN049 and those ranked higher be approved for funding and that the administrator include a cautionary note to the author of proposal #08PN041 stating that future proposals should be written with a higher degree of clarity. Kurt Volker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (This motion reflects proposals #08PN037, #08PN048, #08AN052, #08AN051, #08AN031, #08PN050, #08AN033, #08PN040, #08AN045, #08AN028R, #08AN038, #08PN049, #08PN041, #08AN034, #08AN047, #08PN035, #08AN043, and #08PN032)

Byron Phillips brought up proposal #08AN025R. Byron preferred to fund this proposal at a reduced rate of \$18,000, in order to show that the commission does not want to fund this project in perpetuity. Doug Walsh stated that other funding sources would not be distributed until March. Chair Masters stated that the proposal was probably already submitted to other funding sources. Andy Jensen asked for clarification on any message that Byron Phillips wanted to convey with reduced funding. Byron Phillips stated that he felt the poplar IPM is important, but that the commission doesn't want to be seen as a place for ongoing funding. Alan Schreiber said that he felt like this was a good project and that it is productive, but that he doesn't want this proposal to become a line item. Andy Jensen said that the commission doesn't have anything in the RFP to the effect of what Byron is talking about. Kurt Volker stated that he doesn't feel that we need it written in our RFP. Doug Walsh stated that this is a productive project and that this project sends in comprehensive reports. Kurt Volker stated that the co-funding was troubling and that if we under funded and then they will want the other \$10,000.

Art Losey moved to accept proposal #08AN025R at the presented funding amount on the condition that if the nursery Board co-funds the promised \$10,000, the WSCPR will reduce their funding by that amount and that the administrator and chair will have some discretion on the negotiations regarding funding. Byron Phillips seconded the motion. The motion passed with one vote opposed.

Byron Phillips moved that proposal #08AN036 be denied funding. Andy Jensen seconded the motion.

Doug Walsh stated concerns about the circumstances under which the project was resubmitted, specifically surrounding its resubmission by a different presenter. Chair Masters questioned the need to work with mulches that researcher's previous trials had shown to not work well. Alan Schreiber stated that there is a large need for this research and that the demand is high. Kelly McLain noted that these are not all old mulches and that some new products would be tested. Chair Masters called for the question.

The motion failed.

Kurt Volker moved to approve proposal #08AN0036 at \$3,000 to allow for the research in Eastern Washington, as the commission feels that there is sufficient data from the Western Washington. Erik Johansen seconded the motion. The motion passed with one vote opposed.

Byron Phillips moved to approve proposal #08PN039 at \$15,000 due to no industry co-funding. Bob Berger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Kurt Volker moved to deny funding to proposal #08AN042. Trent Munden seconded the motion.

Discussion occurred. Kurt Volker stated that the proposal did not have enough detail and did not take into account crops that are similar. The proposal did not take into account a good review on when and how to establish cover crops. Trent Munden felt it did not have good methodology. Doug Walsh stated that his main concern was that hops have switched to drip irrigation and there is no ground cover. Chair Masters called for the question.

The motion passed unanimously.

Byron Phillips moved to fund proposal #08AN021R at a reduced amount of \$12255. Art Losey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Byron Phillips moved to fund proposal #08AN002R at \$10,249, to create a 1:1 funding ratio with the USDA W-IPM co-funding for the project. Ben Barstow seconded the motion.

Kurt Volker suggested the commission fund at \$11391 to cover travel and equipment.

Byron Phillips amended his original motion and moved that proposal #08AN002R be funded at \$11391 to cover the cost of travel and equipment. Ben Barstow seconded the amendment.

Discussion ensued on concern that high cost of benefits was unacceptable. Art Losey called for the question.

The motion passed unanimously.

Andy Jensen asked to know other strong concerns on proposal #08AN001R. Ben Barstow felt it was very costly for modeling work. Kelly McLain and Cynthia Lopez both felt that model would not be that useful. Money spent on a model that doesn't work would be lost. Chair Masters felt that this project was high risk. Andy Jensen worried that the commission was prejudging and asked if the hop industry was funding as well. Bob Berger asked if the funding was already obtained or pending. Kurt Volker felt that this was meant to fund 7/10 of a person's salary to perform one trial and that he felt this would be not worked on for 8 months solid. Rick Hamman agreed. Andy Jensen said that they were moving toward an IPM tactic from possibly calendar spray and that this was a laudable goal. Byron Phillips said that in tree fruit a model is only practical to tell you when to begin spraying and he felt that this may be the same in hops. Byron Phillip's researchers felt that the ROC does not work. Chair Masters reminded the commission that there is a lot of existing data that the researchers could draw upon and suggested that the commission fund at lower amount. Rick Hamman reminded the commission that the first line in contingencies on the proposal states that it is high risk.

Andy Jensen moved to fund proposal #08AN001R at \$18,000, with reduction due to 67% OPE charge. Bob Berger seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued. Ben Barstow suggested that if the Hop Commission pulled funding that the administrator consider funding rejection rather than restructuring project negotiations due to the high risk level. Chair Masters called for the question.

The motion passed unanimously.

Byron Phillips moved to fund proposal #08PN044 at \$5000 to more accurately come in line with match amount and due to amount of work that is actually being done. Kurt Volker seconded the motion.

Ben Barstow stated that this work is very important to the industry and said that the researcher does good work.

Byron Phillips amended his motion to approve proposal #08PN044 at \$7,500 and directed the administrator to make a note in the funding letter stating that future proposals should be written in professional language, which would be deemed appropriate by the administrator. Kurt Volker seconded the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Masters stated the total amount that would be funded versus the amount that we had budgeted.

Election of Officers

Ben Barstow moved to retain the same officers as last year. Jay Schafer seconded.

Chair Masters made an offer for anyone else to run.

Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

Erik Johansen asked about the need for raising state EUP's.

Bob Berger moved that the commission support an expansion of EUP's. Ben Barstow seconded the motion.

The current limit on a state EUP is 10 acres terrestrial/year and 1 acre aquatic/year. Acreages up for consideration are up to 100 acres/year terrestrial and up to 10 acres/year aquatic. Art Losey directed the administration to write a letter in support of state EUP expansion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Alan Schreiber went over the Biennial Report. Corrections indicated were that Bob Berger should be taken off and Rick Hamman's name was misspelled. Concern was expressed over the cranberry and burrowing shrimp case studies. Alan Schreiber explained how the commission legislation states that both issues need to be regional, with one being human health and the other being economic. Chair Masters stated that time was needed to review the document. Kelly McLain asked when the administration needed the document. Alan Schreiber stated that the administration needed the commissioner's response by the end of the week at the latest.

Chair Masters moved to adjourn. Art Losey seconded. Motion passed unanimously.