

PSP Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION	START TIME	END TIME
04/03/2023	Virtual	10:00 am	12:00 pm

FACILITATOR	CONTACT EMAIL	CONTACT PHONE
Kathryn Rifenburg	Kathryn.Rifenburg@ODA.Oregon.Gov	971.600.5073

Attendees

Kathryn Rifenburg – Pesticide Stewardship Partnership Coordinator, *Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA)*

Gilbert Uribe Valdez- Pesticides Program Manager, *ODA*

Warren Hanson - PARC Board Coordinator, *ODA*

David Gruen- Columbia River Coordinator, *Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)*

Colin Donald- Water Quality Analyst, *DEQ*

Wade Peerman – Lab Manager, *DEQ*

Rebecca McCoun – Riparian Aquatic Specialist, *Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF)*

Rebecca Anthony, Water Quality Specialist, *Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)*

Lisa Arkin – Executive Director of Beyond Toxics

Kaci Buhl - Associate Professor PSEP, *Oregon State University (OSU)*

Todd Hudson- Public Health Toxicologist, *Oregon Health Authority (OHA)*

Troy Baker – Executive Director, *Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council*

Lauren Kuenzi – Director of Government and Political Affairs, *Oregon Farm Bureau*

Katie Murray – Executive Director, *Oregonians for Food and Shelter*

Lisa Kilders – Clackamas Soil and Water Conservation District

Karen Lewotsky – Water Program Director, *Oregon Environmental Council*

Jeff Stone – Executive Director, *Oregon Association of Nurseries*

Introduction

- Meeting is called to order by **Kathryn Rifenburg**.
- Introductions of committee members.

PSP Strategic Plan Updates and Feedback

- **Kathryn** gave some background on the development of the strategic plan and adjustments that have been made to create the current draft. The first draft was based on feedback given during the first PSP advisory group meetings, based on what they were interested in seeing from the PSP and where they thought the PSP should head. Kathryn stated that the strategic plan was restructured, but maintained the same scope and goals outlined in the original document developed by Kevin Masterson and Kirk Cook. AG members are encouraged to submit feedback by April 20th.

The group reviewed each goal outlined on the strategic plan. Measurable goals were removed from the plan and will go into an annual workplan which allows the strategic plan to remain static through the years, rather than having to be updated every year with new tasks.

- **Kaci Buhl** added that based on her experience with grant administration, it's been more streamlined to have a strategic plan or a mission statement that goes throughout the duration, and then have annual work plans that reflect the activities that will meet those objectives each year.

- **Katie Murray** agreed, but also noted that there are many items in the strategic plan that come across as work plan activities. She suggested separating out those activities from the goals.
- **Kathryn** asked if anyone had any feedback or suggestions on how often the strategic plan should be reviewed or updated.
 - **Karen Lewotsky** suggested reviewing the plan every 6-10 years in order to exercise the full scope of the plan.
- **Katie Murray** proposed that the strategic plan has too many goals and objectives and that they could be summarized and reduced in a way that keeps with the overall goals of the program. Katie noted that some of these goals are not achievable based on the science and data available, such as Goal 6 regarding identifying correlations between local education efforts and water quality improvements.
 - **Kaci Buhl** responded that while it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of outreach programs, it is one of those things that comes up frequently and people want to see evidence if the outreach is effective.
 - **Katie Murray** replied that the effectiveness of outreach can be measured, but she doesn't believe the program has access to the expertise and scientific set up of experimentation required to obtain the quality of dataset to correlate the outreach to the data.
- **Lisa Arkin** commented that the science and techniques are always evolving and expressed wanting to remain open-minded about what could be learned from the data that's collected and how that data could be applicable. She expressed that aspirational goals are worth identifying and discussing.

PSP Advisory Group Charter Review

- **Gilbert Uribe** stated that the PSP Advisory Group Charter Review was previously drafted by predecessors. The original has been restructured and reorganized. He asked for feedback or comments from those who had looked over the document.
 - **Katie Murray** expressed concern that the AG Charter was written in a way that comes across as project managers looking at how the administration is going. She asked about the minimum qualifications and how the members would be evaluated. She also suggested that the included list of skills is possibly unnecessary.
 - **Jeff Stone** commented that it's not unheard of, in the association world, to have competency-based membership. And that can mean a lot of different things for technical expertise versus general expertise.
 - **Katie Murray** suggested adding data and statistics on engagement and outreach activities which would show what the program is accomplishing every year to help evaluate education efforts. She would also like an external review committee to review the grants.
 - **Gilbert Uribe** responded that these grants are closely tied to commitments with EPA and the cooperative agreement. There hasn't been an open invitation to advisory group members to be reviewers of the grants, because it would exclude some of the members and has the potential for conflict of interest.
- **Katie Murray** requested more clarification about the item on the charter that says if a person misses three meetings they may be replaced. She noted that in the past, many have used an alternate if unable to attend and expressed concern on whether that could continue to be an option.
 - **Gilbert Uribe** clarified that in the event that someone needed to miss a meeting an alternate could be used.

Aquatic Life Benchmark Exceedances

- **Gilbert Uribe** indicated that, with the implementation of the data viewer, the results of the water quality monitoring data are more readily available than they have been in the past. He noted that there have been discussions on how to make use of that information in ways that are feasible for the partners. He referred to Kathryn and David to help give an overview.

- **Kathryn Rifenburg** stated that it can take up to two or three months for the DEQ lab to make the data available. Currently, as the data becomes available, it is being uploaded to the data viewer weekly. In the past, data wasn't available to the partners until January or February of the following year. There is still a data review between ODA/DEQ and the local partners that occurs annually but now, if the partners are using the data viewer, they can have updated graphs and access to the information on a weekly basis.
 - **David Gruen** clarified that the data goes from the lab and is published on DEQ's website Ambient Water Quality Monitoring System, then Colin takes it from DEQs public-facing website to put into the data viewer on a weekly basis.
 - **Gilbert Uribe** asked for clarification on the timeframe from the time of sample collection to publication of data. And for comparison of the current system versus the old.
 - **David Gruen** responded that he doesn't have a qualitative breakdown for those numbers. It's about a three month wait from when the samples are collected to when the results of that sample analysis are posted publicly to the AWQMS website and then into the data viewer.
 - **Wade Peerman** added that there is a set standard for turnaround times for all environmental samples that go through the laboratory. Typically, there is a turnaround time of about 45 business days for most routine sampling, but the PSPs data can take longer due to the complexities of the analyses.
- **Gilbert Uribe** stated that one of the things being discussed by the WQPMT is the benchmark exceedances in some of the PSPs. Some of the PSPs already have well established responses to those specific active ingredients as well as established rapport with their applicators. However, some of the PSPs may need additional technical support. There are limitations of the grab samples and the data being collected. Knowing the limitations in the way that funding is allocated and the way that data is collected, it is still important to work toward supporting the partners in addressing these issues. Gilbert requested feedback from the group and any suggestions on how this can be addressed.
 - **Katie Murray** referenced the role that many OSU faculty used to play for the PSP program, which was to be able to take those exceedances and work backwards looking at the data, the location, and trying to deduce where those exceedances might be coming from. This showed who needed targeted education and then allowed them to go out and deliver that education. She emphasized the program's need to identify current faculty at OSU who have the capacity, expertise, and interest to be able to work with this program in that way.

PSP Partner Grants Overview and Recommendations

- **Kathryn Rifenburg** provided an overview of the PSP grant process and award status of the partners. Kathryn noted that there hasn't been an increase in budget, so the PSP the partners have been asked to engage more with the pesticide users and hold more education events while pulling from the same pool of money. She stated that nine applications were submitted and, originally, it was over \$300k of grant money requested. There was a grant review team that reviewed all the proposals and took that average score to rank them. A budget was created to prioritize projects that scored highly and had the potential to have a greater impact and benefit to the pesticide user community. About \$283k was funded for the next biennium which was about \$20k more than the current biennium. Kathryn referred to the grants overview that she sent out, summarizing requested funds and projects that were going to be done.
 - **Lisa Arkin** requested a specific example, or two, of what the majority of the grants are used for.
 - **Kathryn** responded that Hood River is going to host spray calibration and Integrated Pest Management workshops in English and Spanish. They're also going to plant riparian buffers between orchards and rivers. Middle Rogue is going to hold an event on imidacloprid including proper use of it, BMPs, and alternatives that can be used. Walla Walla will be engaging with wine grape growers in this next year.
 - **Lisa** replied that she is particularly interested in the fact sheets that Walla Walla is updating on pesticide concerns. She asked if those could be shared with the

advisory group when they're finished.

- **Troy Baker** responded that they would share those with the group. He also noted that they will be having bilingual workshops every month that focus on the PSP program.
- **Katie Murray** asked the WQPMT to evaluate the larger grants to determine how much is going to education and outreach versus monitoring or staff time and to figure out why some requests are so much larger than others.
 - **Kathryn Rifenburg** responded that it's something they've started to remedy this coming grant cycle, but needs to continue to even out over future grant periods. In order to help make things more equitable across the partners, Kathryn requested feedback and assistance during the next grant cycle, from anyone wanting to review the grant applications with her.
 - **Katie** replied that she would be happy to participate in the grant application form reviews. She noted it's worth looking at the outcomes of having more staff time and suggested potentially limiting the amount of staff time that can be paid through grants because it is such a limited resource.
- **David Gruen** gave an update to the advisory group that DEQ recently applied for additional federal funding under the Columbia River Basin Restoration Funding Assistance Program. This is a new geographic program which was launched a couple years ago by EPA region 10 and the intent of the program is to address toxics in the entire US portion of the Columbia River Basin. David stated that DEQ submitted for \$7 million, over 5 years, to cover a wide range of different projects, one of which is this PSP program. The federal request ask was for an additional \$1 million that would go to boosting educational and technical assistance and other outreach activities under this PSP program. EPA stated they would let applicants know if they have been awarded by this summer. If awarded, DEQ and ODA would have additional funds to provide partner grants, either to the local lead or OSU extension, to provide targeted pesticide education technical assistance efforts to reduce pesticide concentrations in streams.

[Set Meeting Schedule](#)

- **Kathryn** stated that after speaking with group members it was determined that a set meeting schedule would be beneficial for all. She suggested the fourth Tuesday of April and October.
 - *Everyone agreed to this suggestion.*

[Adjourn](#)

- Kathryn Rifenburg adjourned the meeting.