Meeting opened by Jay Brunner

Jay Brunner gave a brief opening statement and introduced Greg Pickel (Wilbur-Ellis) and Aaron Avilla (GS Long) as the newest members of the Advisory Committee filling the need for more industry involvement in the project. He also announced that Marcy Ostrom would now serve on the Executive Committee for the Center for Sustaining Agriculture and Natural Resources, replacing Chris Fiese who is retiring.

**Attendees:**

- Jim Hazen
- Kevin Knight
- Jim McFerson
- Travis Schoenwald
- Aaron Avilla
- Orlin Knutson
- Greg Pickel
- Marcy Ostrom
- Cynthia Lopez (by phone)
- Lee Gale
- Sandy Halstead
- Staff:
- Frank Alvarez
- Gwen Hoheisel
- Keith Granger
- Keith Mathews
- Steve Zediker
- Wendy Jones
- Charlie Pomianek
- Dave Gleason
- Public:
- Ellen Gray
- Rich Fenske
- Michael Genetz
- Jose Ramirez
- Karen Lewis
- Carol Dansereau

The committee was asked if there were any comments or questions about the minutes for the previous meeting. No comments or questions were offered, so the minutes were accepted as submitted.

Jim McFerson and Jay Brunner reported that the first PMTP progress report is due by June to the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA). Brunner indicated that the legislative funds allocated to the WSDA would be paid out as reimbursements for project costs. Jim McFerson clarified that the release of funds would be paid out based on timely submittal of reports. He stated that there has been a good response by WSDA in setting up an accounting for budgets. He mentioned that drafts were submitted to the committee for comment.

Jim McFerson discussed the AG Pilot projects. He stated that the PMTP proposal was one of four projects funded out of 80 submitted and that the AG Pilot program is a new process for the Ruckelshaus Center that is moving slowly. There is no guarantee of continued funding from the legislature for PMTP or the Ag Pilot Project. Continued funding would be based on results, which makes setting targets and hitting them important so we can document the results. While the budgeting process seems cumbersome it is normal for a new process and is a matter of trying to figure out how to channel the money to the Ag Pilot Program through state agencies.

Jay Brunner stated that Nadine Lehrer, a post-doc hired by the project to focus on assessment and documentation issues, would be on the job the end of April or early May. She will work on policy and social science aspects of implementation and provide leadership in documentation through
various survey and interview activities. She will also be able to help with our Spanish needs since she is bilingual.

**Public Meeting Report**

Jim McFerson reported on a public meeting that was held in January in Yakima. The Department of Health helped organize the public meeting. There were about 30 people from WSDA and other agencies and some trade association lobbyists present. A summary about PMTP was given. Advisory member list was discussed along with the mission statement and goals, followed by Q&As. The response at the meeting was positive and supportive. McFerson stated that PMTP project goals should be as transparent as possible. In addition to talking about the PMTP project, Vince Hebert presented results on a fumigation study in potatoes and Mike Yost spoke on his pesticide air-monitoring project.

Jay Brunner indicated that Education and Implementation comprised Phase 1 of the PMTP project. Assessment and documentation will be the next phase along with outreach, which includes farm workers, environmental groups, and policy makers/agencies.

Jay Brunner introduced Keith Granger, PMTP Project Manager for the next topic:

**Implementation Unit Organization, Handbook and Plans.**

The introduction of PMTP started with several industry sponsored grower meetings that were of general interest. There were 50-60 attendees at each meeting. The PMTP project was introduced and interested people were asked to signup as a participant in an Implementation Unit (IU). There are several IUs set up and meetings with these groups have begun. Granger indicated he is working through warehouses and fieldmen to recruit growers and managers and to set up additional meetings. The first two meetings were in Yakima and Quincy in February. He said the training has been well received and that the number of groups is expected to grow as is the participants in each over time. There are 8 more IU’s with their first meeting scheduled for the beginning of March. The warehouse IU in Yakima is already scheduled for their second session. He said that the Quincy IU was tentative at the beginning of the session but by the end they were excited and requested more and longer meetings. The current list of IUs includes: Tonasket, Brewster, Chelan, Orondo, Quincy, Royal Slope, Yakima1, Yakima2, and Prosser.

Keith Granger directed the committee’s attention to the handbook each AC member was given. The layout of the handbook was discussed and each section was briefly reviewed. The handbook was a loose-leaf notebook to allow for adding or correcting materials and that feedback and discussion were a major part of the IU sessions with the intent that members help one another. Future meetings will deal with problems growers/managers are having with new programs. In response to a question Granger indicated that word got out about IU meetings through a combination of announcements made at industry grower meetings, warehouses contacting their growers/managers and chemical distributors and fieldmen, as well as, by word of mouth between growers. The only commitment IU participants had to make was to attend as many meetings as possible and to participate in surveys about their pest management practices as a way to document changes in practice. In response to a question about program failures Granger
indicated this would happen through the IU meeting process. He also said that a future survey should help develop this kind of information.

Granger indicated that when people attend an IU meeting they fill out a form, which includes how they prefer to be contacted in the future. A database on participants is being developed and will be the basis of continuing to get information to IU members. Prior to each scheduled IU meeting email or regular mail announcements will go out to participants.

Jim McFerson suggested that maximum allowable residues be (MRLS, export tolerances) be added to the handbook. He mentioned that NWW has these on there website and that NHC also has this information. Wendy Jones was asked to add a link somewhere on the web site for this information.

In response to a question about warehouses making participation in an IU mandatory the answer was no, that this had not happened.

A member of the AC commented in regard to Mating Disruption, that more education is needed on how to be a good neighbor and about areawide effects. Jim McFerson stated that the most effective means of communications was to share information with your neighbors and get them involved with an IU. He also brought up the need to document the number of IU meeting attendees. A request was made that information be given to Keith Matthews and Charlie Pomianek in the form of generic announcements.

Karen Lewis commented on the issue of public versus private meetings. She stated that all meetings should be public. Lee Gale commented about the old way versus the new way of working and that growers/shippers all need to know about the program.

In response to a question on documentation of pesticide use Jay Brunner indicated that National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) has been the best source of baseline pesticide usage. This agency has been conducting surveys every other year on tree fruit since 1991 and that, because of budget cuts, it is doing its final apple pesticide use survey for the 2007 crop year. Future PMTP surveys will be more specific about patterns of pesticide use and overall IPM practices.

A question was asked about fieldman as participants in IUs. Granger indicated that there was no intention to replace the fieldman in any way. In fact, some of the upcoming meetings are being organized by fieldmen. A concern was expressed by fieldmen/consultants that maybe the handbook is meant to replace them. Brunner reiterated the fact that the handbook is an educational tool. That there is no cookbook method for IPM programs or new technologies and the material in the handbook is intended to provide general concepts. The handbook gives information on the components for IPM programs. Fieldmen/consultants can tailor make programs to fit the growers’ situation. Neither PMTP nor the handbook will replace the role of fieldmen/consultants in the industry.
Karen Lewis asked if water pH sensitivity by the newer chemicals was being discussed in the meetings. Jay Brunner: Success & Delegate are the only chemicals that really have any problem. She then asked if growers check their water pH, especially over the season when it may change. Greg Pickel replied that most don't. Karen Lewis recommended that people be reminded about pH. Jay Brunner said that the PMTP training stresses spray coverage and timing issues but had not dealt with water quality issues.

Keith Granger’s final statement was that the handbook would be online as a PDF.

**PMTP Web site**
Jay Brunner introduced Wendy Jones PMTP Web Coordinator

Wendy Jones brought up the web site home page and quickly went over the main components. Due to the unreliable wireless Internet connection only portions of the full site were shown. When discussing the pending map to show the locations of the IU several suggestions were made by the committee about how to post the information. Concerns were voiced about keeping anonymity of the participants. One suggestion was to use zip codes or to assess logical regions, such as watershed designations since the state is already in the process of doing that. A map could be made where the number of IUs in a particular watershed would be shown.

When discussing where the reference information for the IUs would be posted it was reiterated that neither the website nor the notebook materials are meant to replace field staff or private consultants.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the current event calendars on the site. Some people had problems navigating to the correct calendar to get today’s meeting information. It was suggested that either links for all three calendars be given on the home page by subject or that all calendars should be combined. It was mentioned that the need for the general calendar would be over by March as the rest of the events would be specific to IU workshops or Advisory meetings. Jones said that she would try to have the calendars merged and have the links easier to find.

**PMTP Survey and Discussion of Assessment/Documentation**
Committee members were given a brief overview of the survey mentioning the target and type of information to be generated. The group was asked to review the survey over lunch and give feedback afterwards.

**Public Comment**
Two non-committee members were present at the meeting and were asked to introduce themselves: Michael Genetz, representing Washington Toxic Coalition; Carol Dansereau, representing the Farm Worker Pesticide Project.
Carol Dansereau stated that the meeting notices need to be made more public. She said she had problems finding out about today’s meeting. She also said that the calendars should be merged. Regarding the handbook, she wanted to know if the buffer requirements from water sources was being taught. She also noted that phosmet (Imidan) and chlorpyrifos (Lorsban) are still being mentioned as being used. She wanted to know to what degree growers were being given alternatives for those OPs. Jay Brunner responded by saying that the regulations concerning AZM are being taught. The education to the industry involves how new chemistries fit into their pest management program. He said it is up to the grower to implement the changes. Training covers the benefits of the new chemicals in terms of reentry and safety. He reiterated that there are too many variables to give growers a cookbook strategy and that the grower must adapt the information gained from the training to fit their unique situation.

Carol Dansereau stated that PMTP needs to share with the growers that the public is very concerned about OP usage and less worried about the other chemicals. She said that consumer demands and economic viability should be the growers concern. She said she would like to see work with growers cover broader issues to the society and reforms. Then she asked if the agenda would be set and message sent to the government and legislature. Jay Brunner responded that this project is for education of the growers on new chemicals and the then for the environmental and sustainability community initially and farm workers.

In response to a question about how does Assessment/Documentation fit into the program it was stated that initially the project is directed at education of the growers, then on education of farm workers on new pesticides and the associated relative safety and risks. The general public and policy makers will be educated through documentation of the assessment results achieved by surveys, direct contacts, and outreach programs.

Michael Genetz asked about Public Outreach. He wanted to know how the information would get out to the general public and who would get the surveys. It was indicated that the project is in an early stage. Nadine Lehrer and Jessica Goldberg (WSU, Sociology) will bring their expertise to the project. Information will be made public in the form of news releases, a public website, meetings with the Department of Health, Department of Agriculture, and through the WSU information office. The best source for current information is our website and newsletters that will be coming out. Michael Genetz suggested electronic outreach flyers.

Jim McFerson brought up the fact that this project is primarily about apples, codling moth and AZM usage. In reference to the survey, he said that it is important that good sampling procedures be maintained; it can’t go out to just anyone. Charlie Pomianek agreed and said that the project has a very narrow focus and other things are beyond its scope. Michael Genetz said that not enough information was getting out to the public.

Sandy Halstead said that it would be useful to have a statement about where we’re going and how we will know when we are there. She said we need a better explanation of our goals and mission and the desired outcome. In response it was stated that AZM is the major driver behind this project. The goal is to teach about how to use new chemistries, track the change in usage where
the change is based on education. There is no stated goal to reduce use of certain chemicals by any specific amount, though it is anticipated that this would be a natural outcome of regulatory action and education by the PMTP.

Lunch

Feedback from Advisory Committee on Morning Reports
Cynthia Lopez joined the meeting via phone.

Feedback from the committee was initially centered on survey comments:
Suggested changes were recorded and would be taken into consideration. A question was asked about how to avoid duplicate sampling and an explanation was that surveys would be handled through warehouse lists or directly to fieldmen. It was indicated that a specific number of surveys would be sent out and a specific number returned, which should provide statistical significance. The recipients need to be valid (relevant) subjects. Also, there is the fact that there are limited resources so we need to get information out about the survey to let people know what we’re doing so we can get their feedback. We need good data to make decisions. Surveys are expected to go out in March. It was suggested that the AC could help with publicizing the survey to help keep recipients from dumping them. Ellen Gray offered to help with her mailing list and could get word out. In response to a question about demographic questions it was stated that they are needed to see if there is a difference in how certain questions are answered by different groups of people.

Feedback on the project in general:
In response to a question about worker needs and perceptions and when the project would address this it was indicated that after Nadine Lehrer arrives this aspect of the project would be initiated.

Regarding the AZM Manufacturers Workshops with WSDA mandated training as part of the EPA phase-out agreement for those using AZM: Ofelio Borges (WSDA) along with Leo Garcia (WVC) and Francisco Sarmiento (WVC) are teaching farm workers in the pesticide handler program and incorporating PMTP materials in that training.

In response to a question about orchard managers and how PMTP could funnel training through WVC it was indicated that Leo Garcia would be contacted about this possibility.

Jim McFerson asked about using the grower/shipper organizations either to speak out about the PMTP or to share their contact list. It was indicated by AC members present that they could not give out confidential lists, but that they could pass word to the right people at the warehouses. In response to a question about majority of warehouses and growers were aware project Jim Hazen indicated that at this point he did not think they were. It was stated that ever since FQPA growers have been transitioning away from OPs. However, the general public is not aware of transition and as an industry we need to get the information out about this. Ellen Gray suggested
a press release and Jim Hazen agreed that lawmakers and groups need to be addressed, but that one press release won’t change perceptions.

In response to a question if the project had a media person and how information would get out about field days it was shared that there was no formal media person working with the project though WSU experts should be able to provide support and that organized field tours would be advertised in industry outlets and through public notices.

Department of Health Air Monitoring Project
Jay Brunner introduced Richard Fenske, UW, Occupational Health and Cynthia Lopez, WSDH (via phone) to talk about their upcoming research project (with Vince Ebert, WSU) on air monitoring for pesticide drift in communities and around agricultural land. Richard Fenske said that this project is looking mostly from the public health aspect of off-target movement during and shortly after spraying. He discussed the timeline for this one-year project. He then cited a previous study on aerial applications of methamidophos in rural areas around potatoes and ambient sampling of Wenatchee for AZM and phosmet. A third study was cited: The Farm Worker Pesticide Project Chlorpyrifos Study, which showed levels to be of concern.

There was further discussion about the pending project sampling protocols with a question and answer session following. It was indicated that results of this study would go to WSDH and then to the legislature.

Events Planned for 2008
Karen Lewis talked about planning field days. She said they should be open to the public and should encourage in-field/on-farm discussions. She needs ideas on locations, could be many sites close together. She would like to have workers or managers that are articulate to talk about spray technology and management practices. She also asked about timing of the events. It was indicated that the public would be included but that no buses would be provided for transport between sites. In addition there is an EPA tour on July 22 in Prosser area and PMTP will have a slot on that tour. PMTP will also participate in the annual Horticultural meeting in Yakima and in targeted workshops for the fall and winter.

Feedback
Announcement: The fall AC meeting to be scheduled possibly in early November.

Richard Fenske had a comment about Assessment/Documentation. He said there is a credibility problem. He also said there’s a problem with mixing the survey with worker perceptions. He suggested hitting up the Advisory Committee to review any documents.

Charlie Pomianek directed a question to Richard Fenske: The EPA has dose standards by group. How does your experiment look at short term versus long-term exposure in terms of sub-acute, 4-
6wk exposure? Answer: Acute exposure= short term, which is where the perimeter samples come in. Chronic exposure=long term or annual exposure, is measured by the ambient samples.

Jose Ramirez asked about how to reach people. Jay Brunner stated that help was needed from people who are trusted in the industry to get information to those who need it.

Ellen Gray requested that information to be presented at meeting be sent out before so the Advisory Committee aren’t looking at materials during the meeting and can have more dialogue.

Lee Gale directed comments to Richard Fenske about his study: A one-year study is not enough. If it were a windy year, or no wind year, you could have bad results. Richard Fenske said that he was also concerned, but the study is constrained based on resources provided. There are many possibilities for skewed results due to wind, no spraying, etc. Lee Gale said he was concerned about the perception of the industry being guilty until proven otherwise.

Sand Halstead bought up the Hood River stream sampling study where the levels of pesticides detected were high for a couple of years until the people changed spraying practices resulting in levels of pesticides detected by sampling dropping.

There was a general concern about how Richard Fenske’s results would be written up and made public. He said that any write-up would include comments about the limitations of the sampling methods and possible confounding factors.

Closing
Jay Brunner requested that the committee send any further comments they had to any of the Executive Committee. He also repeated that the next meeting would be in November when program results would be available. It was also mentioned the need for a Southern Region Coordinator and requested people think about if they knew of anyone that might be available to serve in this capacity.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.