

WASHINGTON STATE COMMISSION ON PESTICIDE REGISTRATION
BOARD MEETING
SEPTEMBER 20, 2004, 10:00 AM
VIRTUAL MEETING TELECONFERENCE

In attendance:

In Prosser: Kurt Volker, Chair; Doug Walsh, Andy Jensen,
Staff: Alan Schreiber, Laurie Wishkoski

In Mt. Vernon: Jay Schafer, Bryan Sakuma

In Olympia: Art Losey, Ted Maxwell, Bob Berger, Chuck Masters
L & I Representative: Stefan Dobratz

In Wenatchee: Herb Teas, Dan Robinson

In Pullman: Ben Barstow
WSU Liaison: Sandra Ristow
Guest: Barb Smith

In Yakima: Ann George

Absent: Bill Mason, Kevin Corliss, Kathleen Emmett

Call to Order/ Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 10:07 by Chairman Volker.

Members at each site identified themselves and their respective sites.

Review of Agenda and Timeline

Chair Volker referred to the agenda and requested that efforts should be made to adhere to the timeline as much as possible. Chair Volker asked all members at their relative sites to feel free to speak their thoughts if there were items that were of particular interest to them.

Administrator's Report

Alan Schreiber began his report with comments about the status of research proposals for the upcoming meeting. Four proposals are already in and pieces of others have been received. The Annual Tour is done and the evaluations of the Tour will be presented at the next meeting. Alan Schreiber then spoke about working with Sandra Ristow, WSU, who was compiling stories and information involving the WSCPR for possible presentation to the legislature. Alan Schreiber

then introduced Laurie Wishkoski. Laurie assumes the Assistant Administrator position and began work ten days ago.

Kurt Volker brought up an issue regarding a project that was funded last year. Alan Schreiber had talked to Tim Miller about Tim and Lindsey du Toit's Project # 04AN019 testing mustard biofumigants. Kurt Volker is familiar with the project and he and Alan Schreiber have discussed the situation. Miller and du Toit want to restart this project because in their first planting of mustard, which was winterkilled, they expended about \$1000. Miller and du Toit want the Commission to provide \$1000 to continue the study. It is Chair Volker's opinion that they do not need to submit a new proposal. The Commission, he feels, should be able to approve an extension and grant them another \$1000. Lindsey and Tim, he noted, have a very good history of doing effective work for the commission.

Herb Teas stated that he had no objection to the Chair's suggestion. He was in agreement.

Doug Walsh stated that Tim Miller and Lindsey du Toit would need to request an extension, from Alan Schreiber, to continue the project for another year. Because, as Doug Walsh noted, the money would be spent in a different year.

Alan Schreiber was asked if the extension had already been requested. Alan said that they had not as yet. Miller and du Toit were looking for direction from the Commission. They want to make sure that they know the process that they need to follow in order to get the funds. They need to know whether or not they need to submit a new proposal.

Herb Teas made a motion to allow Tim Miller and Lindsey du Toit to simply submit a new budget and an application for extension. This could be done in the form of a letter explaining the situation and requesting an extension of one year and an adjusted budget request of an additional \$1000 to replenish their budget.

The motion was seconded by Andy Jensen. There was no discussion. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Budget

Alan Schreiber described the budget as rather straight forward. The general circumstance has been, as it was this week, in which the financial report from WSU is received in the WSCPR office on Thursday or Friday. Since this does not leave enough time for the report to be mailed out, the report is copied and brought to the meeting for review. In this instance of a virtual meeting, this wouldn't work. The profit and loss statement was mailed out. This shows the expenditures. The \$5000 amount that was listed as income is, in fact, repayment of an overcharge from the hotel. Alan Schreiber explained the expenditures that are listed. After noting the costs of the Tour, Alan Schreiber related that the Tour actually netted \$1200. Commission expenses, as they usually are at this time of year, are negligible.

Chairman Volker asked if there were any questions about the budget.

Kurt Volker called for a motion to accept the budget report of the administrator.

Ben Barstow in Pullman made a motion to accept the budget report as presented.

Andy Jensen in Prosser seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the budget as presented passed unanimously.

Discussion on the Future of the Commission

Kurt Volker commended the quick pace of the meeting thus far. He said that the meeting at this point was ten or fifteen minutes ahead of schedule. Chair Volker hoped that at this point the commissioner would freely join into the discussion. He was unsure as to the amount of comment to anticipate due to the lack of response to the information on which he and Alan Schreiber had collaborated.

The first item to discuss is the Options Paper. It was hoped that all of the commissioners would join in the discussion. Kurt Volker prefaced the discussion with the statement that there was no need to rush to make a decision. The purpose of the discussion was not to make a decision but to explore all of the options. A time line could be put together. A piece of necessary information is not available to the commissioners yet. The original motion was made by Art Losey at the last meeting. (The motion by Art Losey is on page 6 of the July 13, 2004 minutes. It reads in part: 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....) In the original motion we had the intent to do an economic analysis of what we are trying to do here. We have not talked to the economics people to see how we stand on that issue. Chairman Volker enumerated and described the options noted in the options paper.

1. We change nothing. We continue in the present function.
2. A simple name change of the Commission.
3. Ask for more money. More money would allow us to do more of what we do and maybe do it more effectively and possibly with a broader scope.
4. This option would entail a fairly substantial overhaul and with a request for even greater resources.

Chairman Volker reminded the commissioners that there is an election coming up. It is quite possible that the election will bring changes with it which may influence our decision. Kurt Volker felt that the Commission would probably not want to make a decision until after the election. Kurt Volker ended his introductory comments and asked Alan Schreiber if he had any comments to make.

Alan Schreiber remarked that if he started talking on the subject then he probably would talk for a long time. He would make comments later.

Chairman Volker announced that the discussion was on the Options Paper and opened the discussion to the group. He asked for comments.

Alan Schreiber's understanding is that WSU is solidly going ahead with the pursuit of their "core funding". Sandra Ristow agreed that that was correct. Alan Schreiber went on to say that no ag specific legislative initiatives were going forward by WSU. Sandra Ristow concurred that there were no initiatives that were named as such. Upon further questioning by Alan Schreiber, she went on to say that she had been told to relate that WSU is pursuing core funding. It is an initiative between U of W and WSU. WSU has no official position on WSCPR's draft legislative options. WSCPR was free to pursue the options of its choice. WSU will continue to accept money from WSCPR.

Alan Schreiber stated that Pete Jacoby's, WSU, assessment was much the same as Sandra Ristow's with the exception of being a bit stronger in one aspect. People in WSU's College of Agriculture, he felt, would be more than happy (whether formally or informally) to support a move to have WSCPR increase their funding for ag research within the state of Washington. A rationale for this is that most, probably a majority, of the funding would end up in the hands of WSU. Sandra Ristow agreed that that would probably be true.

Alan Schreiber went on to say that at one point in time there was a consensus of opinion within agriculture in the state of Washington to increase funding for ag research. Commodity groups thought that they would go for this through WSU but it appears that that is not going to be the case. Alan Schreiber asked Ben Barstow to shed light on a conversation that he had had with Gretchen Borck, of the wheat growers, on the way to the meeting. Alan Schreiber related Gretchen Borck as saying that the wheat growers had adopted the position to support the effort for core funding at WSU. While the wheat growers did not have any formal opinion on what the Commission is considering, Gretchen Borck recommended that no formal position be taken until after the elections.

Ben Barstow responded that he had talked at length with the current president of the wheat growers. The wheat growers position was that they didn't want anything to occur that might jeopardize the security of the core funding proposal. Ben Barstow agreed that it was prudent to wait until after the election to make a decision. He reasoned that even if it made it a bit late to act on a decision that it would give a more accurate picture of what the Commission was up against.

Alan Schreiber asked Sandra Ristow if she believed that Option 4, which calls for a revised mandate and increased funding, posed a threat to WSU's core funding initiative. Sandra Ristow responded in the negative. WSU's core funding initiative, she felt, was separate from the WSCPR initiative actions.

Ben Barstow added that he felt that the question was one for the legislature to answer. It depended, he felt, on how that legislature wants to deal with the issue. How that legislature views agriculture. If the new legislature views ag research, in general, as a part of WSU, if they see the two as in any way linked, then they won't put any money in WSCPR without taking it out of somewhere else. Sandra Ristow added that there was a reported one billion dollar deficit.

Alan Schreiber concurred but offered that new projected forecast of the deficit showed it narrowed somewhat due to increased property tax revenue. In any case, there is a budget shortfall.

Alan Schreiber questioned Kurt Volker about the agenda. Alan Schreiber wondered whether the sub-headings under the “Discussion on the Future of the Commission” segment were actual topics or food for thought. Kurt Volker replied that they were things for the commissioners to be thinking about prior to the meeting.

Alan Schreiber asked if anyone had a problem with waiting until after the elections to make a decision whether or not we want to do anything.

Ann George thought that would be a wise course of action.

Herb Teas in Wenatchee agreed that any discussion now was preliminary. Any decision should wait until after the election.

Art Losey thanked the Commission for putting together the information and options. He felt that it was most helpful. Art Losey agreed that it would make the most sense to wait until after the elections to get a feel for the situation.

Bob Berger joined. He reported that he agreed with what he had been hearing.

Jay Schafer in Mt. Vernon indicated that he had a question. He felt that there could be no resolution regarding options without addressing the issue of whether or not to change the RCW.

Kurt Volker agreed and said that the Options and the possible changes to the RCW had received very little feedback from the commissioners. Chair Volker asked what the Commission wanted to do. A sub-committee to review and study the issue was an option. Everyone taking the time to study the issues and the proposed documents in great depth was an option. Kurt Volker asked the commissioners for comment.

Chuck Masters in Olympia responded. It was very important to have a great deal of discussion before proceeding to decision making. The issues and the options needed to be thoroughly discussed. If the Commission is going to choose Option 4 then that sets the tone for changing the RCW.

Alan Schreiber gave the group some background. He said that it was obvious that the commissioners did not want to select an option right now but it is important to know the pros and cons of each option. Option 1 is the safest option. We don't have to do anything.

Alan Schreiber described Option 2 as having virtually no risk. Option 2 is creating legislation that would allow the Commission to change its name.

Alan Schreiber stated that he felt that Option 3 had no risk to the existing enabling legislation. Getting a name change is non-controversial. This option is low risk. The only real risk involved is spending to time and energy asking for money and not getting it. The risk is putting forth the energy and failing.

Option 4, said Alan Schreiber, is one where we would open our enabling legislation to change. If we changed our mandate, we would probably bring a couple more positions on to the commission. This option will require that changes are made to our mandate. This will require a lot of work and a lot of thought and a lot of planning. Alan Schreiber doesn't see it as involving more risk or planning than what was done in 1999. It would not be advisable to pursue Option 4 without widespread support from commodity groups or, at the very least, no opposition. We would not want to go to the legislature with a house divided. We would also need a champion in each of the chambers.

Jay Schafer asked for clarification on the issue of the RCW. He asked Alan Schreiber and Kurt Volker if he understood correctly that if Option 3 was selected there would be the same number of commissioners and Option 4 would include an animal husbandry seat. Kurt Volker responded that Option 3 was to increase funding moderately and to change the name.

Jay Schafer asked if it also included language to open up to alternative sources of funding such as organics. Upon questioning it was ascertained that Jay Schafer was referring to the proposed RCW changes.

Alan Schreiber explained that he had put together the proposed changes to the RCW so that the commissioners would have something to look and think about. It doesn't have to be the final version. It is a possibility. Alan Schreiber believes that if the mandate is opened up for revision that it is important to have a member from the livestock industry. It has also been suggested to have an official seat for organics, although we already have organic growers on the Commission. Initially the language said 8 members from the following segments, then two were added in to make it 10. Later other members were added in.

Kurt Volker reminded the group that this was only a draft. It was a document that had received little input other than from Alan and himself. It was not something that they were terribly attached to rather it was a preliminary effort.

Alan Schreiber asked Jay Schafer to reiterate his question.

Jay Schafer said that he believed that the Commission was putting the cart before the horse. The RCW should be dealt with before making a decision about the Options.

Alan Schreiber stated that the Option Paper is the first thing that should be looked at. He feels that, rather, it would be putting the cart before the horse to look at the RCW first. It is only in contemplating Option 4 that the need for revision of the RCW arises. When the Options Paper was circulated in small groups it was difficult to envision what the necessary changes to the RCW might be. It was to address this difficulty that Alan Schreiber made available possible revisions to the RCW. The preliminary proposed changes to the RCW are attached only to

Option 4. Selection of Options 1, 2 or 3 would render the proposed RCW changes moot. If we are considering Option 4 then we need to look at changing the language in the enabling legislation. If we go with Option 3 then we won't have a livestock person or an organic person on here.

Kurt Volker concurred. Option 3 does not necessitate a change in our enabling legislation at all. We will only ask for more money and a name change. Kurt Volker continued saying that although this issue has been discussed at many meetings he was unsure as to the feeling of the Commission. It was possible, he felt, that the Commission would elect to jump right in with Option 4. It seems, however, that the call is to move slowly and with prudence waiting until after the election to make a decision. Kurt Volker is personally all ready to go with Option 3 because the Commission could use the money. Option 4, though, is a pretty significant step. He addressed Jay Schafer and stated that a Commission selection of Option 4 would have necessitated dealing with a revision of the RCW to continue the discussion.

Art Losey agreed that Option 3 posed little risk. The only risk is not giving the Commission any money and only giving a name change. Option 4 however does carry risk. It is entirely possible that the legislature would grant the revision to the enabling legislation but not the funding. The Commission then would have two additional members but no more money. Art Losey recommended that a caveat be put into the legislation to the effect that if there was no additional funding then there would be no additional members.

Alan Schreiber agreed. There would need to be two separate requests to the legislature that would go through separate committees. One would go through the Finance Committee. One would go through the Ag and Ecology Committees. We do not want either a funding increase without a mandate increase and we especially don't want a mandate increase without a funding increase. The way to deal with these problems is to have your champion kill the legislation if it starts going badly. Art Losey agreed. Alan Schreiber went on saying that this is the way that it was done in 1999. At that time the request for a funding increase and the request for a mandate change went along on parallel tracks. Our requests were surprisingly non-controversial when they went through last time.

Art Losey commented that the amount of money that the Commission was asking for with Option 4 could be very controversial.

Bob Berger spoke to a concern of his. He has spoken to Alan Schreiber of his concerns over the phone. He is opposed to the idea of the Commission losing its focus on minor crops and minor uses. It is beginning to sound to him like a general ag research commission not like a minor crops and minor uses pesticide management commission. Bob Berger asked whether or not the Commission really wanted to give up that distinction and so lose our acceptance with such a broad spectrum of the legislature and our success with getting funding.

Chuck Masters added to Bob Berger's comments. He feels rather ambivalent toward a change as major as Option 4. Any chance of getting this legislation passed would need agreement and support from all of agriculture. Bob Berger suggested that the focus be on minor crops in order to gain support. There is a tie between the pest management on minor crops and the culture of

minor crops. This seems to be a missing link in the state. Minor crops are big business in the state but are not recognized that way when it comes to supporting research. Expansion in this area would most likely garner support. Support would come from both the growers of the minor crops and the state which benefits from the growing.

Alan Schreiber addressed Bob Berger and Chuck Masters. The way the Commission is set up right now a lot of the funding goes to minor crops and minor uses. He does not see that Option 4 would shift focus away from this. Now we are funding research on, say, an asparagus pest or a noxious weed in a stream. If we expanded our mandate with Option 4, we wouldn't change our focus but we would be able to fund research on fertility in asparagus, irrigation techniques in nurseries or roadside work. We wouldn't change what crops we serve but be able to do more kinds of research for them.

Chuck Masters replied that this was what he had been saying. It also is important that the RCW is written to reflect this goal. Without the language the whole process can become muddled and hard to manage. Alan Schreiber agreed saying that it would be an easy fix. It could just be written in there.

Kurt Volker agreed with both Chuck Masters and Bob Berger. He reiterated that it was important to maintain the focus on minor uses and crops. It is certainly not the intent of the Commission or of the proposed changes.

Herb Teas carried on from Bob Berger's and Chuck Masters' comments. His understanding is that this was a limited commission when it was formed. The proposed changes to the RCW would create a very 'un' limited commission. Herb Teas voiced concern that the increased mandate and the changed name would give the impression of trying to be all things to all people. It could conceivably anger a lot of people and we don't want to do that. We need the support of a broad spectrum of ag and that's not going to happen if they are angry. It is important to get an understanding of how the legislature feels about this. That will be more important than how we feel.

Art Losey felt that the language containing the phrase 'research in all areas of agriculture' was indeed too broad. He felt that the name should more closely reflect the intent. Alan Schreiber referred to the second sentence of the proposed RCW that states the purpose of the Commission. Art Losey explained that his concerns were more in respect to the title.

Alan Schreiber explained that very little time had gone into the wording of the title. The title, he felt, would evolve naturally as the Commission decided on an option and clarified their direction. In response to a question that Herb Teas had asked earlier, Alan Schreiber gave two examples of things that we don't want to fund. The examples he came up with were an ag econ study and funding for marketing. He agreed that there was room to be more specific about what we want to do.

Kurt Volker added information to clarify the intent on the 'purpose' language. He had written it even though saying 'in all areas of agriculture' was too broad. He had written it so as not to limit

the Commission to just certain areas. He suggested the phrase ‘in all areas of agriculture emphasizing minor crops and uses’.

Chuck Masters noted that the Commission was already funding projects that did not deal with minor crops. The projects involved minor uses but not minor crops.

Kurt Volker reminded the Commission that all of the proposals are strictly preliminary and in a draft stage. He asked the commissioners if it was time to take an opinion poll. Prior to taking a straw poll, Chair Volker asked if there were any issues that were of exceptional concern for the commissioners.

Bob Berger spoke up. He could not think of any examples of research that would be covered by Option 4 that would not fall into the Integrated Pest Management concept. Kurt Volker responded with the possibility of a project to increase levels of vitamin C in a food crop to increase nutritional value. That was a good example of what Bob Berger was looking for. Alan Schreiber gave two more examples-research on an improved method of irrigation in asparagus or looking at the rate of weight gain in chickens. Alan Schreiber went on to say that the Commission had had to turn down a proposal to research new crops for Western Washington.

Ted Maxwell explained that his concerns dealt with language. We may know what we mean by language but to others it may mean something else. Other groups could bend the language to fund projects that we don’t want. The language could create conflict where none had occurred before. We have to be careful of how we word the legislation.

Alan Schreiber responded that that was why these are just drafts. They have had very little circulation and we’re interested in getting feedback on these issues.

Kurt Volker added that just because there were four options on the paper did not necessarily mean that there were only four options. In his case Option 4 was not his favorite option but it did go to the limits of the Commissions previous discussions. The purpose in providing multiple options was to get feed back and provide alternative information to help give direction.

Herb Teas interjected that the cost of an economic analysis had not been determined. He felt that the legislature could not be approached with a request for more money unless it was supported by that analysis. He asked as to the status of that investigation and whether any steps had been taken to hire an ag economist. Kurt Volker replied that this was the part of the motion that had not been completed.

Alan Schreiber responded that if we select Option 1 or Option 2 we probably don’t need an economic analysis. He said that until he had a better understanding of the direction desired by the Commission he felt ill-equipped to provide a framework to guide the analysis. He felt that a decision to go forward with this would be made at the October meeting.

Ann George asked if there was a motion on the floor. Alan Schreiber responded that the references to a motion referred to the minutes of the last meeting. The motion had included direction to find out the cost of an economic analysis to assess the impact of the Commission.

Ann George expressed interest in laying the groundwork for Option 2 or Option 3 over the next month. She is very uncomfortable with the idea of proceeding with Option 4 at this point in time. We need to have a much more solid block of support built across the greater ag community before we pursue that option. Ann George credited Alan Schreiber with being very active in initiating conversation with commodity groups across the state but she does not feel that the block of support is solid enough for us to proceed. Her feeling is, depending on the outcome of the elections, pursue Option 2 or possibly Option 3. Continuation of discussions about Option 4 would help decide whether or not this was the best vehicle for an expansion of ag research.

Alan Schreiber continued on that subject. The Commission definitely does not have the support to go ahead with Option 3 or Option 4 at this time. Option 2 would be straight-forward. He went on to say that one of the reasons that there is no solid block of support is that the Commission's house is not in order. Alan Schreiber has circulated this proposal to some of the commodity groups but it is difficult for them to be wholly supportive if the Commission is undecided as to whether or not it wants to proceed. Alan Schreiber reflected that he had not heard any support for Option 1. If the Commission rules out Option 1 that is a significant action. Ruling out Option 1 indicates that the Commission is planning to take some action in the legislature.

Ann George gave the opinion that she could not rule out Option 1. She did not feel that a decision could be made regarding Option 1 or Option 2 until after the election. Based on the outcome of the election she could vote for Option 1. Ann George stated that there was a tremendous amount of legwork that needed to take place to move anything forward even Option 2. We need to find a champion for even Option 2 because it would be at risk of getting lost and falling through the cracks. These activities could be going on in Olympia over the next 30 to 40 days. Until the outcome of the election was known and had been evaluated for its potential impact on agriculture related legislation, she did not want to say that she supported either Option 1 or Option 2.

Alan Schreiber attempted to sum up the comments so far on what he should be doing. The basic assumption is that everyone understands what Option 2 would mean to us. He feels that it is necessary for him to firm up the implications of Option 3 and Option 4, particularly Option 4. If the Commission waits until November to make a decision, which Alan Schreiber believes should be done, then all four options are still open. He believes then that he should move forward with developing all four.

Ann George said that her vote would be to lay the ground work for Option 2 and, possibly, Option 3. She could not under any circumstances support Option 4 during the 2005 legislative session. She does not feel that the Commission is ready to do that. There is not the block support needed throughout the ag industry. Ann George does not feel that we have the time to generate that level of support before the start of the session. We snipe at WSU for not involving us in the process early enough and giving us information far enough in advance to give us adequate opportunity to comment. We are talking about an effort that will require every group and their lobbyist being on the same page as to the priority of this effort and everyone being in lockstep ready to go.

Alan Schreiber replied that he had talked to all that were active in the legislature and had given them opportunity for input. Ann George asked if they were all overwhelmingly in support of Option 4 and ready to commit the support of their legislative action programs. Alan Schreiber replied that they were not. He added that he would be surprised if they were because the Commission had not even committed to it. Alan Schreiber said that he was on the agenda to talk to them about this issue on October 18.

Ann George acknowledged that she may be unaware of some of the contacts that are going straight to Alan but expanded on her concerns. No commodity groups had come up to her and asked for help saying that the WSCPR must expand their mandate because they could get money into WSU no other way. Ann George asked Alan Schreiber if that were, in fact, occurring.

Alan Schreiber said that that was not happening and that was not the way that it would work. There is a general consensus among ag groups that there needs to be increased funding for ag research. The general feeling was that WSU was the vehicle to get this done. The Commission then approached WSU asking that increased funding for ag research be incorporated into their funding request. WSU refused. The Commission then asked if WSU would support them if the Commission made the request on their own. WSU said that they would oppose it. The alternative then was that the Commission act as a vehicle to increase funding and distribute money for research.

Art Losey continued with Ann George's train of thought. Any major idea like Option 4 should be given a year for industries to get used to it and provide input. It needs a year to breathe. To try to push it through too quickly would be folly. He suggested allowing Option 4 kick around for a year. If action was to be taken this year, it should be Option 2 or Option 3 and let Option 4 cook.

Kurt Volker asked for other comments.

Chuck Masters thought that Ann George's comments made a great deal of sense. His feeling was that if Option 4 were put up to a vote, as large and all-encompassing as it is now, the Commission would vote it down. A favorable vote might be given if the option was a hybrid with specific reference to minor crops and minor uses and what was not included. Everyone then would understand what was included. Whether or not there would be time to pursue that possibility prior to this legislative session is unclear. It would, however, provide the basis for talking to the ag community and the legislature about what it is that they thought that they could support.

Doug Walsh said that over the last three years there has been an erosion of the core funding. He went on to ask how difficult it would be, if the Commission went with Option 2 and a name change, to add a statement of 'not less than \$1 million'. The purpose of this would be to prevent the further erosion of the Commission funding. We have given up funding due to budget cuts. This would be a way of getting back to that \$1million level. He did not feel that the \$1million level would be controversial. Art Losey responded that he was unsure how the legislature would react to a mandated floor. Kurt Volker asked Sandra Ristow if this approach would rock WSU's boat. Sandra Ristow agreed that this would probably be the case.

Kurt Volker asked for any additional comments or suggestions for new possibilities.

Ben Barstow agreed with Art Losey that Option 4 was a big leap. He thought that the idea to let the concept cook for a year was a good one. He went further to say that maybe the issue of a name change should wait for a year also.

Jay Schafer referred back to Herb Teas' comments. If the Commission was considering Option 3, it would be a good idea to pursue the idea of an ag economist. In the event of a favorable outcome to the elections we would then be prepared to move ahead.

Alan Schreiber agreed. He thought that the information gained from an economic analysis would be extremely valuable regardless of the option pursued. Knowing the economic significance of what the Commission is doing would be valuable even if we decided not to go to the legislature at all. Kurt Volker agreed and said that the Commission would move forward with the ag economist as that was part of the original motion.

Kurt Volker again called for comments.

Ted Maxwell spoke regarding his concern about multiple trips to the legislature. There is a possibility that the Commission could pursue Option 3 during this upcoming legislature and continue to promote Option 4 for the following year. His concern revolved around the idea of going back to the legislature for changes two years in a row. He suggested that there should be one trip only to the legislature. It might be a better idea to do it all at once. His experience indicated that it was an uncomfortable experience to go two years in a row.

Art Losey agreed that it was difficult to go to the legislature two years in a row especially for money. He thought that it was a good use of time to have a year to get support lined up and all the bugs out of the issue. It is better to go in with a package and go in with one shot.

Alan Schreiber gave background information on past trips to the legislature. In 1995, when the legislation passed, the move began at this time of year. In 1999, the issue came up and was talked about at the July meeting and started becoming a serious issue in September. The Commission has not taken a year to put things together in the past. This does not mean that it can't. Alan Schreiber asked the commissioners what they would do differently with 15 months instead of 3 months. The players are already known to the Commissioners. The Commission already knows who to talk to. He asked if the Commission needs 15 months to line up support.

Art Losey replied that it does need that amount of time to line up support. All it takes is one or two important people to ask for changes and cause the whole process to have to be restarted. The issue will have to be re-circulated through all of the players again. If this happens it can cost a significant amount of lost time and momentum. It is best to have everything nailed down and your champion lined up before the legislature even begins.

Alan Schreiber replied that the Commission would, more than likely, not line up a champion before November anyway. It would be best to wait until committee assignments are made. Kurt

Volker concurred, reiterating the consensus at the beginning of the discussion that no decision would be made until after the election.

Kurt Volker offered a summary of the discussion. 1) The Commission needs to wait until after the election to decide on an option. 2) The commissioners need to do further review on the options. 3) The Commission needs to delay at least until the next meeting to make a decision. 4) The economic analysis should be pursued. 5) Commissioner are asked to continue to think about these options and asked to compile lists of thoughts, options and concerns. At the October meeting the commissioners are asked to be ready to give their thoughts and opinions. Kurt Volker felt that by having a month to think about the options each commissioner will be ready to give a considered opinion. He reflected that it had been productive for him to hear the discussion and input of the other commissioners.

Doug Walsh offered that his experience with ag economists showed that they tended to be rather expensive. He wondered if the Commission was planning on requiring the economist to go through the standard format. Kurt Volker clarified that the motion was to identify the cost of an economic analysis. Doug Walsh suggested that it might save time if a sum was agreed upon and the Administrator sought out an ag economist and offered a dollar amount.

Chuck Masters asked to be refreshed about the economic analysis. Alan Schreiber replied that the purpose was to look at the economic significance or consequence of the Commission's projects. It is designed to give the Commission information that can be shown to the legislature as proof of the Commission's effectiveness and worth.

Alan Schreiber estimated that about three weeks could be saved if the Commission followed Doug Walsh's suggestion. Alan used the figure of \$5000 to support an ag econ study. Doug Walsh remarked that that would not buy ½ hour of time with the ag economists that worked with a strawberry issue. Doug Walsh felt that the figure needed for the economic analysis would be much higher than \$5000 unless much of the work was done in-house. Alan Schreiber asked Sandra Ristow what her opinion was. Sandra Ristow replied that she would have to go to the School of Economics to ask them what this would cost. She suggested that contact be made with Ron Mittlehammer. Alan Schreiber added that he had been recommended an economist that worked at WSU and a private economist in Yakima. He also added that the Commission staff would be heavily involved.

Kurt Volker said that the motion that was to be fulfilled was to establish the cost of the economic analysis. This should not cost anything. The Commission just needs a bid. The commissioners will be apprised of the findings at the October meeting.

Kurt Volker asked for comments on his proposal that the commissioners spend the next month studying the options.

Andy Jensen said that he thought that it was a good idea. He did not feel comfortable contributing to the political conversation and would appreciate the added time to study the proposals. In his opinion, based on what he had heard, he didn't think that the Commission was ready to make any decisions.

Doug Walsh asked the commissioners if, in an ideal world where everyone would support them, they would support Option 3. The commissioners were asked if there was anyone opposed to Option 3. There were no commissioners opposed to Option 3.

Ben Barstow added that if the Commission chose Option 3, then he believed that there should not be movement on Option 4. Pursuing Option 2 or Option 3 should preclude pursuing Option 4 in the near future. Alan Schreiber agreed with an exception. If there was substantial pressure from outside the Commission to pursue Option 4, it would be reasonable to look at the possibility. He added that he did not feel that Option 2 precluded Option 3.

Doug Walsh added that there was no reason that Option 3 could not be enlarged upon. An organics seat and an animal husbandry seat could be added to the Commission with the focus still being primarily pest management. Kurt Volker agreed and said that there was no restriction as to the amount of money asked for with Option 3. The proposals are just drafts.

Kurt Volker asked to table the discussion until the next meeting. Chair Volker asked that the commissioners study the options, come up with their favorite one and provide rationale for their choice. He added that he was going to put a slash through the RCW revision. If anyone was interested in writing their own revision, they could do so.

Discussion of the Minutes

Kurt Volker had some less than significant grammar corrections that would be passed on to Laurie Wishkoski.

Andy Jensen had minor corrections that were given to Laurie Wishkoski. He continued with questions about the Ann George motion regarding the funds being placed in an interest bearing account. Alan Schreiber replied that it was in the works but they were waiting on some reimbursement money to come in from WSU. Andy Jensen questioned the apparent insertion of the contents of a conference call into the minutes. The passage in question started on page 4. Kurt Volker responded that the conference call was actually part of the meeting. Alan Schreiber added that, due to a lack of a quorum, commissioners had called in to participate.

Kurt Volker called for a motion to accept the minutes as written with a few changes in verb tense. Andy Jensen so moved. Doug Walsh seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Upcoming Meetings

The next meeting will be the 26th and 27th of October at the WSDA building. Their building is on First Avenue in Yakima which is just west of the railroad tracks. Directions will be sent out.

Chair Volker asked the commissioner once again to spend time on preparation for the next meeting. Look at the options and think about the future of the Commission. He asked that everyone think about the discussion today.

Kurt Volker commented that the video meeting was cost effective but not as good as communicating face to face. Doug Walsh said that this was better than a meeting with no quorum. Art Losey said that he would much rather have a video conference than have to travel. Doug Walsh told the Olympia site that they were the only site to cost money. It cost \$30.

Alan Schreiber talked about the January meeting. If anyone was unaware, the reason that the Commission holds its meeting then is to coincide with a large pest management meeting. Many of the presenters for the WSCPR are also presenters for the pest management meeting that is held in Portland, Oregon. Alan Schreiber promised to look for a more cost effective meeting location but could not guarantee it would happen. Logistics come into play. Kurt Volker said that he would prefer not to be in the sub-basement of the Hilton as in previous years. Doug Walsh said that he could contact OSU about their Learning Center in downtown Portland. It might be a bit of a walk but it would probably be free.

New Business

Alan Schreiber asked if Kurt Volker had been reimbursed for his submitted expenses. He replied that he had not been reimbursed for his travel in July. Art Losey was unsure whether or not he had been reimbursed. Bill Mason was not in attendance. Alan Schreiber addressed Sandra Ristow with his concerns about lateness of payments and lack of notice if there is a financial irregularity to be addressed. The contract states that payment will be made within a month and notification of any problems would take place within a week. Sandra Ristow said that she would look into the issue that day. Doug Walsh suggested to Sandra Ristow that it might be possible for the commissioners to be put into the automatic reimbursement system. She said that she didn't know if it was possible but she would ask about it. Kurt Volker said that he was going to charge \$1.17 in interest and asked Sandra Ristow to please help with this inconvenience.

Kurt Volker asked for any other new business. He said thank you to the commissioners for the good and thorough discussion and also food for thought. He said thank you to Laurie Wishkoski for jumping into the job and thank you to Doug Walsh for thinking of and setting up the video conference.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50.