Welcome & Introduction - Jay Brunner (following roll call)
Introduction of PMTP staff and committee members thanked for attending.

Overview of Progress, Funding, Reporting and Personnel – Jay Brunner
Jay reported that funding obligations in the way of reporting requirements have been met and that there is sufficient funding to take the project through the biennium (end of June). Specific funding issues to be discussed by Jim McFerson and Bruce Grim.

Ruckelshaus Center & Ag Pilots – Jim McFerson & Jay Brunner
The Ag Pilots project was a program developed by the Governor to address issues with agriculture and the environment working together to achieve solutions to the benefit of all the people of the state. Four projects were funded from discretionary funds. PMTP was judged one of the top ranked projects that exemplified the Ag Pilots program objectives. The Ag Pilots money brought an Assessment Specialist to the PMTP project allowing for a broader outlook.
Jay clarified that the Ag Pilots funds paid for Nadine and a portion of Wendy's salary to provide the outreach and communication portion of the overall project.

State Funding & WSHA Support for PMTP – Bruce Grim
Bruce talked about the revenue shortfall and that the projected $6.3M estimate will actually be higher. This means that discretionary funds will be gone. At the Fruit Day with the legislature the program was discussed. Originally the legislature was asked for an additional $500K in project funds but the proposal was then pared down considerably. There is considerable interest and support for the project, but with decreasing revenue estimates it's uncertain if any funds will be available.
A question was asked if industry funds were being put up to help leverage state funds. Bruce answered that potential industry matching funds have not been looked at yet. But that is an area to address if there is a possibility of funds.

Jim commented that this project is not a research project and is really about outreach and extension. The current funding climate at WSU will likely result in a disproportionate decrease in Extension funds for projects like this one. And this is not the type of project on which industry dollars are spent.

Jay mentioned that WSU is going through lots of funding cut projection exercises with the outlook not looking good as a source of support for us. He did say that money is available to stretch the project funds to the end of the year. Additional funding sources are being explored and will be discussed at the end of the meeting.

**Evaluation of Implementation Units (IUs) and plans for 2009 – Keith Granger**

Keith handed out and discussed the summary of results from the TurningPoint survey questions asked at the year-end IU meetings in November combined with the same questions posted on the web for those who could not attend those meetings. The questions were handed out at the last advisory committee meeting in October. The Summary report can be downloaded at: [http://pmtp.wsu.edu/downloads/IU_Survey_Summary.pdf](http://pmtp.wsu.edu/downloads/IU_Survey_Summary.pdf).

Plans for this year include trying to get more researchers involved in IU meetings, and to try to space field days out more and further away from cherry harvest. Also, plans include more intensive training on how to use WSU-DAS to help with the confusion some people seems to have with the system. Keith reported that the Handbook was updated for this year (new/updated pages distributed to committee) and that more information will be added to the handbook including more on secondary pests and maximum residue limits (MRLs). Outreach to the Hispanic growers that was managed by Naná will be attempted with Nadine’s help.

**PMTP Website – Wendy Jones**

Wendy gave a brief overview of the updates to the PMTP web site. The new WSU identity template was used to help reorganize and reduce the page clutter. The updated handbook is online and available for download as one complete file, separate sections, or just the individual updated/added pages.

The consultant survey results were added to the Assessment & Documentation section of the site. Sections of the survey can be viewed by using either the navigation tabs on the page or the ones in the main navigation column to the left. Once the grower survey results are in they will be posted in a similar fashion.

The sign-up forms for the implementation units and the newsletter mailing list were changed to be more target-specific and incorporate some invisible form validation elements to help keep the level of SPAM down. Also, the public feedback form was improved and is now available in Spanish.

Some basic web usage statistics were shown that compare the unique visitors of this site to those of the DAS site and the Cullage Education site, all at WSU-TFREC with usage information maintained by Wendy. The PMTP site has about 70% fewer visitors than DAS and 55% fewer than the Cullage site. However, these other two sites have been online longer and
received more advertising through meetings and working groups. The PMTP visitor counts were compared to two additional sites from the college, Center for Precision Agriculture (CPA) and Agriculture and Food Systems (AFS). PMTP had 40% fewer visitors than CPA, but nearly 10% more than AFS. One thing to note about the college sites’ visitor numbers is that they may not exclude the members of those programs that visit their own site whereas, the PMTP counts filter out project staff and TFREC internal visitors. In any case, this indicates that the PMTP website is attracting a normal amount of web traffic. Links to PMTP were added to the GS Long and Wilbur-Ellis websites in early December. This should help to attract more relevant traffic. Wendy also reported that the site is attracting considerable traffic from the state government, which indicates that they are taking a good look at our project.

Plans for the web site include adding more tracking code to allow us to count the number of times material is downloaded off the site, such as the handbook material and newsletters. This should yield a better picture of the usefulness of the site material and let us know what people are doing when they come to the website. Also, more security codes will be added to eliminate more of the false form submissions.

A major addition to the site will be an interactive moth and larvae ID Guide that will allow someone to compare images and descriptions of different orchard pests. Once a collection of images and descriptions are compiled, a hard card set will be developed and made available for sale to the public similar to the UC Davis Orchard IPM cards. The difference between this planned set and the UC cards is that it will focus on Pacific Northwest orchard pests and natural enemies.

**PMTP Surveys - Nadine Lehrer**

2008 Consultant Survey Results: The committee was given a copy of the survey results in their meeting handouts and this file is available online for viewing or downloading at: [http://pmtp.wsu.edu/survey_res.html](http://pmtp.wsu.edu/survey_res.html) (See report for full summary and tabulation of results). The survey results will be mailed to all consultants that were asked to participate and they will be invited to submit comments on the results. Timing of a follow-up survey addressing 2008 consultant recommendations was discussed. April was the original target time, but committee members felt consultants would be too busy to participate. July was proposed as a possibility, but the consensus was that a fall survey would be best. With the later timing, the survey would address 2009 pesticide/IPM recommendations that shouldn’t vary much from 2008 since the options for control would be the same.

2009 Grower Survey: Nadine reported that a grower survey was mailed out on February 25th. There will be two mailings plus a postcard reminder. Like the Consultant Survey, the grower survey can be done either on the web or on paper. There were 3776 growers on the final list; 2000 names were randomly sampled for the actual survey participants. Survey results with a hoped-for 50-60% response rate will be completed this summer.

**Decision Aid System – Jay Brunner** (following short break)

Jay gave a brief update and overview of DAS. He stated that WSU does not have the financial resources to maintain the system, but does support a self-supportive business plan, meaning that if money can be found from grants, industry, etc., the system can continue. Currently, there are operating funds for 2009. A manager is in the process of being hired to oversee DAS and to take over the training and educational aspects. Thanks to a top notch
programmer the DAS interface has been overhauled and new features added. We will now be looking towards the industry to be primary sponsors, as well as looking at a possible fee system. Ads could also be placed on the web pages as long as there are no hotlinks to outside sites. When asked about the assessment of a usage fee and how much it would cost to run DAS, Jay stated that $1/acre would be enough to maintain the system and provide for education and improvements such as adding more models.

Lunch Break

Plans for 2009 – Keith Granger

Keith gave a brief report on the status of the Implementation Units (IUs). The most successful groups from 2008 were those affiliated in some way to a warehouse or with other close ties to an existing entity. Two groups in particular had low attendance: Chelan and Yakima General. A new Zirkle affiliated group will be started in Yakima and a group in the Prosser or Pasco area is in the process of being set up by Astrid Goplen, with this later group being open but possibly being loosely associated with a local warehouse such as, Douglas Fruit. A new Chelan Fruit/Magi group will be started up in Brewster, replacing the past Chelan group. A group may be started in Manson if there is enough interest. Nana’s Wapato Hispanic group will continue with help from Nadine. Also, Keith is seeking WSDA pesticide credits for meeting attendance.

Pesticide & Safety Outreach Efforts – Nadine Lehrer

Nadine presented data collected using the Turning Point system during the Spanish language sessions at the annual WSHA meeting, and at other Spanish and English language training sessions at pesticide recertification classes over the past few months (7 sessions with a total of 914 survey respondents; some possible duplicates from attending multiple sessions). The survey questions dealt with different aspects of pesticide applicator knowledge about pesticides including usage, labeling, and safety. Respondents were asked about their work role relating to pesticides, what crops they worked in, if they used pesticides or supervised the use of pesticides, their knowledge about AZM and new pesticides, their understanding of labels and signage, and other safety aspects related to pesticide usage. The purpose behind the survey project was to get a sense of what pesticide applicators and supervisors (mostly Spanish-speaking but also some English-speaking) feel about pesticides they work with or around. The committee asked Nadine what she was planning to do with the results and how it applies to the PMTP project. She stated that this was an aspect of the AG-Pilots project outreach efforts to an under-served portion of the tree fruit industry. She said that it was encouraging that the majority of the respondents felt confident in their understanding of pesticide safety issues. The Turning Point survey results are available online at: http://pmtp.wsu.edu/downloads/TurningPoint_data_results.pdf

Nadine then asked the committee to review some ideas regarding pesticide safety posters showing the relative toxicity of the most commonly used tree fruit pesticides. The committee was concerned that this might be outside the purview of this project and that once any material is developed it would quickly become outdated and possibly not targeting the actual need, such as learning how to read labels. But in general, the consensus was that
using the logo fonts from the pesticide labels along with the basic toxicity grouping in columns was the most readable and recognizable way to go.

**Other Funding and Project Outlook – Jay Brunner**

Jay discussed other funding possibilities for extending this project. The American Farm Land Trust, administered through EPA, was not funded at this time because the matching state funds are not guaranteed. However, it is rated high if state funding comes through and/or if budgets can be reconfigured. Another supplemental funding possibility is a project initiated by Nana through Larry Ellsworth to do training materials on monitoring and sampling. Other possibilities are out there if some state funding comes through. There are also SARE and WRIPM center grants that can be submitted.

**Open Questions**

A follow-up question was asked about the possibility of an assessment being added to the current apple assessments to support DAS. The answer was that something like that would need to go through the legislature. Another question was asked about developing a user fee system for DAS. Jay said that it could be done but would be complicated by the fact that many users are support users that provide recommendation for several other people. So there would need to be a way to assess higher fees for users with multiple sites. There was also a concern voiced about funding the consultant survey if it goes out after June when the funding technically ends. The amount of $6500 was deemed the cost of putting out that survey. Assurances were made by the industry representatives present that the amount could be covered for such an important source of data.

**Meeting adjourned.**