

Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration

July 8, 2008
Ag Development Group
Eltopia, WA

Chair Masters presiding.

Chair Masters called the meeting to order at 10:15am.

Commissioners present: Doug Walsh, Trent Munden, Rick Hamman, Ann George, Andy Jensen, Bob Berger, Byron Phillips, Bryan Sakuma, and Chuck Masters.

Staff present: Erin Gwinn and Alan Schreiber

Guest present: Heather Hansen, Washington Friends of Farms and Forests

Financial Report

The year end financial report was presented. All items on the profit and loss report were explained. Alan Schreiber explained all account balances. Alan Schreiber explained all new items on the check detail. Alan Schreiber explained the Invoices sent out for the tour, both for sponsors and attendees. Andy Jensen asked about the missing checks on the check report, it was noted that there were duplicates for checks 1529, 1530, and 1531. Alan Schreiber stated that this would be checked on the lunch break. Approval of the budget will wait until a new check detail has been produced.

Approval of Minutes

Andy Jensen stated that he had a couple of minor edits to the minutes as drafted; these were handed in to Erin Gwinn. Erik Johansen and Kurt Volker e-mailed edits to Erin Gwinn, these edits were shown to the Commission.

<p><i>Andy Jensen moved to approve the minutes with proposed corrections. Bob Berger seconded this motion. Motion approved unanimously.</i></p>

Administrator's Report/Tour Report

Alan Schreiber explained the USDA-ARS policy on contracts under \$15,000. Alan explained that this would cause a different contracting process to be used for the most recent project submitted by the Washington State Potato Commission through researcher Tom Unruh. Washington State University, WSU, is in the process of drawing up amendments to a previous contract in order to circumvent having to create a new contract under \$15,000 which the USDA-ARS will no longer perform.

The WSU-WSCPR MOA was received by the Commission on June 30th; this will be signed by Chair Masters after the meeting and will then be sent to WSU.

Alan Schreiber stated that this year one of the challenges of the tour has been having too many people who would like to be involved. Schreiber explained the teleconference that was held on June 2nd in regard to the tour and how the Commission office should deal with the high number of attendees including how to prioritize attendees if a waitlist occurred.

Alan Schreiber explained the tour agenda thus far including any changes that have occurred since the last meeting. Ann George noted that Mark Nelson has not been contacted yet to help with the hop stop, Alan Schreiber stated that he would contact him. Rick Hamman noted that the wine and juice grapes stop would be held in an area of Wade Wolfe's vineyard.

Alan explained changes in the tour schedule due to taking out the pesticide container recycling project. There will be more potato stops during the day and a grass seed stop will be added. Alan Schreiber stated that historically we will not know where the potato harvest stop will be, Trent Munden stated that there will be a potato project digging on Glade and Garfield during the second day of the tour.

On the third day of the tour a Walla Walla Sweet Onion stop is slated. This stop is currently in negotiation between Alan Schreiber and grower Bud Locati.

Alan Schreiber passed out the tour attendees list. Ann George asked about the Etigra attendees, Alan Schreiber explained that Etigra is a pesticide company which has recently been purchased by NuFarm.

Alan Schreiber handed out the tour budget. He noted that this is a preliminary budget. Alan Schreiber noted that the projected costs for the tour, although including more people, are lower than last year due to the tour being held on the east side of the state. Alan Schreiber explained the budgeted incoming tour money versus the actual money that the Commission had received thus far. Schreiber stated that the tour should come in at or under budget and noted that there are still several sponsorships which are unaccounted for on the budget projections.

Request for Proposals

Doug Walsh had a comment about the budget page, due to the specialty crops grants being included in the farm bill there will be quite a few researchers using those funds and we should expect to see these used as match on our next round of proposals.

Alan Schreiber stated the problem of the declining level of funding given to minor, minor crops. Ann George asked whether this was due to lack of proposals or due to lack of funding. Alan Schreiber stated that we have fewer minor, minor proposals. Doug Walsh stated that there are fewer researchers working on the minor, minor crops, but at the same time there are people who have been chastised for lack of a match, this is also causing fewer minor, minor proposals to be submitted.

Alan Schreiber felt that part of the decline had to do with a lack of matching funds, but he also feels that fewer people are doing minor, minor research. Alan Schreiber reminded the Commission that local county agents should be used as message force multipliers in order to encourage more minor, minor submissions.

Chair Masters stated that the Commission isn't really sure what the reason is for declining minor, minor submissions, but that what is certain is that we do need to pinpoint this problem. Chair Masters felt that we needed to include more outreach in the RFP, possibly even in a survey form. Chair Masters also requested that we include some type of outreach in the cover letter to the RFP. Alan Schreiber stated that we would be sending this out to the people that we know about, not the groups we don't know about and that very well may not be aware of the Commission funds which can be used to help with research. The Commissioners will receive and be able to review the RFP list before lunch. Kurt Volker felt that declining minor, minor submissions does not have a lot to do with finding an appropriate match; he feels that this is entwined with universities currently following very specific programs. Kurt Volker suggested possibly prodding county extension agents to submit proposals. Ann George agreed with Kurt, she stated that in the past the Commission has been willing to fund sound proposals with small grower and industry matches. Kurt Volker suggested that the Commission keep seeking smaller proposals and coaching researchers. Doug Walsh stated that it is easier to get registration for a product than in the past, the IR-4 project has simplified this and in many cases there is no need for efficacy data. Alan Schreiber stated that he felt this wasn't an issue of funding fewer minor, minor crops as these proposals generally come in at a lower dollar amount than a proposal from a commodity group within the top 20 agricultural commodities. Chair Masters stated that the downward trend can't be ignored. Kurt Volker stated that we don't have personnel in extension areas that are very active with the minor, minor crops and submitting proposals to help out smaller commodity groups.

Kurt Volker suggested that the fact that a 1:1 match is suggested but not required should be highlighted. Chair Masters asked how many Ag consultants and county extension agents were aware that they could get money from the Commission for research projects. Kurt Volker stated that the Commission needs to make sure to send the county extension agents the RFP, Erin should send e-mails to or call county extension agents about the RFP and as a personal reminder. Byron suggested getting the extension agents together for a lunch or a dinner and suggesting that they submit proposals. Doug Walsh stated that

there is a WSU all-extension meeting which could be used to this end. Bob Berger stated that in the past there were several demonstration projects which were funded. He questioned the recent drop off of those projects. Alan Schreiber stated that the same RFP has been used, but that we have not received proposals to this extent. Bob Berger suggested that Master Gardener's programs could benefit. Alan Schreiber stated the approach the Commission should take sounds like it could be outreach with targeted e-mail, phone calls, and one on one interaction in order to try and get more minor, minor proposals. Doug Walsh suggested dealing with the regional directors for the extensions would be best. Kurt Volker stated that he would be happy to represent the Commission at some type of dinner or meeting. Kurt Volker reminded the Commission that the dates on the RFP need to be updated before the RFP is sent out.

Emergency Request Clarification

Alan Schreiber stated that the Emergency Proposal guidelines are open at this point because due to their nature they can come in at the last minute. Chair Masters suggested that the Commission should require the proposal be submitted 14 days before the next meeting. Alan Schreiber stated that a caveat should be added to the extent that this could also be waived. Trent Munden felt that the Commission should keep the 14 day requirement and if it is within 14 days of a meeting that a special meeting would need to be called. Chair Masters stated that the Commission has an obligation to make sure that any research that is to be done, even in an emergency situation, is good research. He feels that there is no way around the Commission having a two week minimum time frame to review and evaluate a research proposal. The Commissioners felt that to have emergency proposals turned in fourteen days before the next meeting would be adequate. The office will have a one day turn around time in getting the proposals out to the Commissioners.

Commissioners felt that the first paragraph of the "Purpose of Request for Proposals" was confusing. Ann George felt that the sentence in the parenthesis should be removed.

2009 Legislative Agenda

Alan Schreiber gave an overview of the Commission's 2008 legislative happenings. There are two issues on the table for the Commission in 2009; proceeding with the name change and also attempting to get increased funding. Andy Jensen felt that the name change needs to happen, more funding would be nice but the name change is a necessity.

Alan Schreiber introduced Heather Hansen to the group. She works in Olympia, WA lobbying for agricultural concerns.

Chair Masters reviewed the need for a name change. The Commission feels that the name needs to be changed in order to give a more accurate perception of what the Commission does. Ann George asked Heather Hansen why the bill didn't pass. Hansen stated that in the crunch at the end of the session a bill to change a name was less important than a bill that was going to be more damaging or influential. There has to be a list of priorities and the name change was not one of the top issues as there were toxics reduction bills also in

play which were of a higher priority. Alan Schreiber stated that if we were to go up for a name change again we could do what we have done previously. Hansen stated that the bill itself was fairly innocuous. One item that worked against the Commission was that there was another bill at the same time which had the same short title and dealt with changing the definition of IPM. This was the first time that several commissioners had heard of this having happened. Chair Masters asked Heather Hansen to give an impression of the changed name itself and perceptions that this new name had within the legislature. Heather Hansen stated that there was a common feeling among legislators that IPM reduces pesticide uses because they are bad and we should use less. Ann George asked whether we should change to the Commission on Pest Management, Hansen stated that changing the name from Washington State Commission on Pest Management from the previously run Washington State Commission on Integrated Pest Management seems logical as the new name loses the buzz word “integrated”. Andy Jensen stated that his concern is not with getting the enabling legislation changed; if there are people who would want to have the legislation changed they could have done that in any previous legislative attempt. Alan Schreiber said that he also felt this wasn’t a big problem and that in a way the bill suffered because it was boring and non-controversial. Bob Berger stated that he felt that the problem was not in the content, but in the understanding of the content. Alan Schreiber commented that the bigger concern was the last minute crush of bills. Heather Hansen stated that asking the Commissioners to talk to their lobbyists was a great first step, but that there should have been more follow through after the bill was introduced.

Chair Masters asked for Heather Hansen to speak in response to running the name change and what happened within the legislature. Hansen stated there was an initial communication about the bill but very little follow up and the message to push the bill never really got thorough to the ag lobbyists. Bob Berger asked about advantages to starting the bill earlier in the legislative season. Hansen said that earlier is always better. Heather stated that because of the bill having no fiscal note that it can be passed through easily.

Chair Masters asked for discussion related to changing the name from Washington State Commission on Pesticide Registration to Washington State Commission on Pest Management.

Ann George moved that the bill to change the Commission’s name to the Washington State Commission on Pest Management be pre-filed with hearings the first week of the legislative session and no budget notes included. Bob Berger seconded. Motion passed; one voting member opposed.

Ann George asked for an explanation of Byron Phillips’ opposition. Byron said he felt that there are better ways to educate within the legislature in regard to what the Commission does without risking the enabling legislation.

Heather Hansen stated that she felt that when the funding increase was part of a big research initiative it was more likely to get passed than if the Commission go in with

WSU to get more money. Alan Schreiber stated that he would see what WSU was looking to do this year; he felt that last time WSU was adding the Commission to their bill in order to reduce the likelihood of not being funded.

Alan Schreiber asked if the Commissioners would like to plan on pursuing a funding increase. The Commissioners felt that this was a good idea. Alan Schreiber will contact WSU in order to find out what they are planning to do for the upcoming legislative session. This issue will be tabled until September when there is a more definitive idea of what WSU is planning.

Alan Schreiber brought up the Commission financial report and explained the earlier question regarding the check numbers. Several checks had been entered with incorrect check numbers when these checks are renumbered and resorted, there is one missing check. This check has most likely been filed out of order. Ann George recommended that we wait until the September meeting when the check number 1532 has been found to approve the budget.

Other Business

Doug Walsh stated that he will make arrangements for the virtual meeting.

Ann George moved to adjourn the meeting. Byron Phillips seconded. Motion approved unanimously.