

WASHINGTON STATE COMMISSION ON PESTICIDE REGISTRATION  
BOARD MEETING  
JULY 13, 2004, 10:00 A.M.  
ELTOPIA, WA

IN ATTENDANCE:

Kurt Volker; Chair, Chuck Masters; Vice Chair, Ann George; Treasurer, Bryan Sakuma, Art Losey, Stefan Dobratz, Dan Robinson, Doug Walsh, Bill Mason, Bob Berger, Kevin Corliss, Jay Schafer, Andy Jensen, Ben Barstow, Herb Teas

Absent:

Kathleen Emmett, Ted Maxwell

Guests:

Sandra Ristow, WSU

Staff:

Alan Schreiber, Administrator

Deena Martin, Assistant Administrator

Meeting called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Chair Volker.

Introductions were made by all. Public comments: Sandra Ristow mentioned a meeting that occurred last week which will be discussed later in the day.

Minutes:

Andy Jensen, page 1 May minutes Andy's name misspelled. Last page third line up from bottom. Ann George reported on the recent **FEQL** board advisory meeting. Correct spelling of Vapam. January meeting-Bob Berger was in attendance. Jay Schafer was in attendance at the January meeting, but arrived late.

Chair requested a motion for approval of the minutes. Commissioners requested a deferral of May's minutes to just after lunch. Ann George motioned to approve March, 2004 and January, 2004 meeting minutes, as presented today. Motion seconded by Dan Robinson. Verbal vote taken, motion carried.

Financial Report: Alan Schreiber reviewed financial records with those in attendance. Schreiber mentioned Ann George's request to place funds that are in excess of current month's expense into an interest bearing account. Alan Schreiber explained that had not occurred yet due to the recent return of funds from January expenses and the tour

expenses, but an account will be started after the 2004 Pest Control tour. Alan Schreiber continued through year-ending 2004 financial reports. Alan Schreiber reported on the WSU Reports received for Research Allocation. He continued financial reporting with the report on Check Detail.

Financial year ending 2005 Profit and Loss report: Schreiber reviewed the report; mention was made regarding the annual meeting reimbursements.

Herb Teas joined the meeting late at 10:25 a.m.

Ann George made a motion for approval of the financial reports as presented, including disbursements with check numbers (1437-1443) and total expenditure of \$5674.83, as shown and presented on the reports. Motion seconded by Art Losey. Verbal vote taken, motion carried.

Discussion was held in response to the question regarding WSCPR being subject to audit. The response was that WSCPR is subject to audit. Sandra Ristow provided final information regarding audits. Ann George suggested that in a future meeting, after further information from WSU, we may want to ask the state auditors if we could have an external audit done every 5 years or so that impacts funds outside the WSU funding guidelines. By securing external audits, the Commission will be demonstrating due diligence with its fiduciary responsibilities.

Administrator's Report: Alan Schreiber spoke on the decline of support for agricultural commodities in general. Schreiber spoke of meetings held with WSU College of Ag administration. Alan Schreiber mentioned that if the WSCPR pursues a legislative option, it will need to be separate from WSU's funding request through the state.

The next scheduled meeting is October 26-27. At this time there is no meeting in September. If there are things to be discussed beyond proposals, we either need to discuss those things today or have a September meeting. Herb Teas reasoned that if there are legislative issues to be discussed later, then a September meeting will be necessary. A suggestion was made to table the decision until we have the legislative conversation this afternoon.

Tour: Alan Schreiber passed out an agenda of the tour to all attendees. He reviewed the agenda, tour stops and sponsors, as well as attendees.

Alan Schreiber briefly reviewed buffer zones for commodity groups.

Alan Schreiber reviewed the new Commissioner's list.

Review of FY 2005 Request for Proposal: Annual review. Page 2 dates need to be updated. Final page-project budgeting and response dates need to be updated.

Page 3 speaks to guidelines for submission. Volker would like the guidelines of the RFP to be more strictly adhered to. If they haven't met the guideline, their proposal should be discarded. Dan Robinson and Bob Berger agreed with Volker's thoughts. Teas stated the policies and procedures have left it up to the discretion of the Administrator. Alan Schreiber stated he is the great enabler of this bad behavior. Alan Schreiber suggested he would be willing to have proposals come in early for review to ensure they meet the guidelines. Commissioners instructed the Administrator to follow the guidelines with proposers, as written.

Ann George suggested merely date changes should be made and leave the rest of our guidelines alone. Doug Walsh suggested a statement in the category about "benefiting human health" and ensuring information can be verified. Alan Schreiber stated on page 5 - regarding protecting human health and proposers will use this language. Schreiber suggests taking out examples or include a statement that human health information should be verifiable. Walsh stated he'd like to allow the Administrator more latitude with new proposers versus those who've been proposing.

Teas moved on Number 1: "The Commission does not accept reduction of pesticides to be per se an improvement of human health. It follows then that any designation of such claim must be accompanied by support of that claim. Each proposal must provide an explanation of the selected category designation." Andy Jensen seconded the motion. Verbal vote taken, motion carried.

Ann George suggested match from private sources, versus federal. Kevin Corliss suggested just listing "private". Herb Teas stated the original intent was to erase the line between public or private funding. Alan Schreiber stated we were not going to restrict what could be used as a grant for matching funding. However, the source of the funding would be viewed. Functionally, we are unevenly applying judgment across the proposals. Alan Schreiber stated if we put restrictions on matches, we will have a huge problem. Bob Berger stated if they get them to fill in the source of funding, that is what is needed. Andy Jensen feels we should keep track all funds coming in, regardless of where they come from. Ben Barstow stated we need to keep in mind why we are keeping track of matching funds. Alan Schreiber stated its there to show where funds are coming from and provide that information to the public. He then stated it is important to make sure the source of the matching funding is identified.

Kurt Volker -page 3 italicize matching funding must be identified, last sentence—source must be identified. Ann George wondered if private, state and federal funding should all be considered in matching funds and that a statement in the RFP should be stated as such.

Dan Robinson brought up the possible conflict of interest regarding commissioners' proposals being accepted when others' are not. He feels that someone other than a commissioner should represent the proposal during the presentation process. Alan Schreiber stated that sometimes it's difficult to find someone else to present proposals. Dan Robinson doesn't want the perception being put out that presenters come from the Commission. Art Losey shares some of Robinson's concerns. Bob Berger stated his concern regarding introductions at the start of each meeting. He stated that everyone

indicates that they are “representing” instead of “nominated by”. Alan Schreiber suggested developing a policy that states that voting commissioners cannot make presentations unless extenuating circumstances exist. Chair Volker stated he feels there is awareness there could be a potential conflict of interest in presentation of proposals observed. Commissioners are aware of this and will make every effort to ensure conflict does not occur.

A break took place at 11:55 a.m. for a tour of the fields at the ADG farm.

Lunch was held at 12:25p.m.

Session was called to order again at 12:55 p.m. by Chair Volker.

Chair Volker introduced speaker Vince Hebert, WSU FEQL. He spoke of the history of GLP’s, GLPs in general and what has been happening in the environmental quality lab over the last 4 years. He circulated a binder of work done at the lab. He provided everyone with a handout of GLP overview. Only 10% of FEQL’s funding comes from WSCP. Questions were asked by Commissioners and the Administrator. Mr. Hebert was invited to stay for the next portion of the meeting regarding the 2005 legislative plan.

2005 Legislative Plan—includes a teleconference call with Kathleen Emmett, Dept of Ecology and Mike Norman, representing Ted Maxwell, WSDA. Also on the teleconference were Charlie Brown, Advocates, Inc. who is a Washington state lobbyist, and Richard McCartan of the Attorney General’s office. Mike Norman’s associates were Bob Arrington, WSDA and Lee Faulconer, WSDA.

Chair Volker spoke of the two facets of a legislative plan. Kurt Volker spoke of expanding or broadening our current mandate. He believes the current mandate is broad enough to fund more projects. He believes that changing the mandate is a big move that will have large impact on the commission and its’ size and responsibilities. Basically, he believes we have 3 choices – 1) to do nothing, 2) increase funding or 3) to broaden our mandate and increase funding.

Charlie Brown gave a brief synopsis of his education and positions he has held, as well as a partial list of his clients which includes the Potato Commission and the Asparagus Commission.

Alan Schreiber asked the Commission if there are any things that they think need to be done that are not covered by our mandate. He asked the Dept of Ag if they know of something we should or could be doing that we don’t do now. Lee Faulconer stated he thinks WSCP has a broad mandate and cannot think of anything else to include. Herb Teas mentioned the agronomic research that was requested. Commissioners mentioned there is not enough funding in the budget to cover that type of research, nor is it part of the mandate.

Alan Schreiber polled most of the commodity groups for state funded increased research funding. It appears that there is a need for approximately \$20 million in ag research. Ann George felt we need to think this through very carefully because of the commission size, complexity of committees on the board, etc. Herb Teas wanted to know what part of agriculture we're not involved in. Schreiber explained several different research areas.

Question was asked: mandate change or do we want to keep going? Consensus is that current mandate is broad enough.

Increased funding request for 250-500K. Alan Schreiber asked Charlie Brown what his best guess was on the ability to secure funds. Charlie Brown feels that lower dollar requests are easier for the legislature, as well as the new biennium budget. WSCPR also has a good history and one that covers many commodities. The fact that agriculture is still the largest representative area in Washington makes it even stronger. All this adds up to a positive prospect in the legislature. We can come in with a proposal that's fairly defined and representative of commodity groups and non traditional commodity groups, too. Ann George asked about implications of elections in November. Charlie Brown thinks the proposal won't be hurt at all. Ways and Means has ag people who sit on that committee. Support would come from several sources. Alan Schreiber asked the commissioners what their thoughts are about going to the legislature to ask for increased funding because of our history but also to get into other areas such as host plant breeding. Charlie Brown stated there is no risk in asking for more money, so long as it can be well substantiated. If you have program and reasoning for it, there should be no risk. Kurt Volker asked if we're better off acting independently or with FEQL and Center for Sustaining Agriculture. Do we need to consider the other two's records? If they are a drag, that would not be as good. Bob Berger asked about the issue of changing the name of WSCPR. It would require going through our enabling legislation and opening it up. We can do it and we could get that passed. The commission could have a legislative issue so narrowly specified that it should pass with no problem. Charlie Brown excused himself to leave for another appointment. Art Losey and Bryan Sakuma feel that we should make the request alone, without the other two agencies and justify our needs. Andy Jensen stated that based on the proposals we receive each year, are there proposals that we haven't funded each year. Kurt Volker stated there are proposals that have not been funded because of priorities placing them low due to funding limits. Andy Jensen mentioned the need for documentation to show the legislature to ensure increased funding. Chuck Masters stated he supports getting increased funding due to our good record. Chuck Masters feels there have been increased numbers of proposals and projects. He loves the plant breeding area that should be supported. Alan Schreiber suggested we consider equipment requests with additional funding.

Kurt Volker felt we should come up with a dollar amount and justification for an increase in funding. He suggested that we will need to have a meeting in September to work through this process. Alan Schreiber stated that if we do this, it is beyond him to provide all the necessary information. He feels we should get an Ag economist to provide the information. Getting an economic impact statement would work well with the

legislature. Alan Schreiber proposed that a motion be put forth for an RFP for an economic lobbyist who could work with us at the September meeting.

Chuck Masters wonders if we could get some assistance from WSDA, but WSU could help with economist.

Alan Schreiber spoke regarding whether or not a name change can be a part of some other legislation for financing. He feels this could be worked on further for the Sept meeting. He felt a lobbyist in Olympia would be great. A possible name change would be to Washington State Pest Management Commission.

Motion by Art Losey to direct leadership to put together short document of our legislative position for funding and justification, a commission name change, a request to identify the cost of an economic analyst and then email to the Commissioners for further discussion in September. Herb Teas seconded. Discussion: Ben Barstow suggested \$250K for plant breeding, \$250K for grad students and \$250K for equipment. Discussion was tabled because it was not pertinent to the motion. Herb Teas felt that right now the legislature would see this as our request was to get money and then we would figure out how to spend it. Verbal vote taken, motion carried.

After discussion, it was determined that a September meeting would be held on September 20 or Sept 9, Sept 29 from 10-12. Video conferencing would be made available to us through WSU and Doug Walsh at no cost. A video conference would be considered a legal meeting, according to Richard McCartan, AAG. All commissioners were in definite support of the video conference.

January meeting locations: Portland meeting possibly held at another location. Meeting to be held in conjunction with Pacific Northwest conference,.

Discussion on motion on 3<sup>rd</sup> page: Andy Jensen had minor word changes to minutes. Ann George moved to approve minutes with corrections provided. Jay Schafer seconded. Verbal vote taken, motion carried.

Motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 3:01 p.m. Meeting was adjourned by Chair Volker.