

PSP Stakeholder Advisory Group

Mission: Improve and protect water quality by reducing the frequency and levels of pesticides detected.

How do we achieve our mission?

Strategic plan questions.

1. Sampling Scope?

- a) Systematically evaluate different watersheds/land uses across the state and gather data on whether pesticide concerns may exist; and reach out to potential partners in new prospective PSP areas?

or

- b) Continue to focus on watersheds where current-use pesticides are likely to be a problem given the land use(s).
 - a. Should we focus on complex watersheds where demonstrating outcomes is likely to be more difficult?
 - b. Should we focus on less complex watersheds with a few predominant uses, for example mostly urban, mostly 2 - 3 specific crops, mostly forestry etc.
 - c. Or should we focus on watersheds where past experiences predict that we are likely to see meaningful improvements?

2. Selection of PSP areas

- a) Are there areas of the state where the program should be reaching out to local stakeholders and pursuing exploratory monitoring? If so, what criteria should we use to identify those areas? (recommend intensive ag & urban land uses based on existing data gathered through program)
- b) Should the program conduct a prioritization exercise with GIS? If so, what layers should we use in the prioritization exercise? What other resources should we use to cross-check our GIS analysis?
- c) Should the program refine its criteria to initiate exploratory monitoring in a watershed and if so, how?
- d) What should be the criteria for the program to proceed with a committed or pilot PSP area in a watershed?
- e) Should points be assigned to EJ concerns and what should be considered an EJ concern? How should we incorporate cultural concerns (i.e. cultural importance of salmon) into our accounting of environmental justice?
- f) Should the program regularly review and score each current and proposed PSP area using scoring criteria, and use the scoring criteria to make funding decisions for the coming biennium? Could WQPMT do this every biennium and then bring recommended funding to advisory group for feedback?

- g) How much information should we have for a pilot area before it can become a full PSP area?
 - h) How much reconnaissance work (i.e., adjusting monitoring locations and timing based on local knowledge) should be done before discontinuing a pilot area project?
3. Connections with other programs
- a) What are ways that PSP can connect more closely to the ODA ag water quality program?
 - b) What are ways that PSP can connect more closely with DEQ and municipal stormwater programs in urban areas?
 - c) Recommend using PSP watersheds as one of the selection criteria for locating a SIA within a management area. Need to make sure that PSP monitoring plan is updated to include monitoring questions related to co-locating a SIA with a PSP.
 - d) How should the PSP program align with the 100-year water vision and other water quality improvement endeavors?
4. What criteria should PSP use to evaluate and prioritize spending of grant dollars to local and state partners?
- a) How an area scores in terms of the existing scoring criteria
 - b) Local partner should propose the budget that is needed to show meaningful change in terms of outcomes
 - c) Existence of or plans to develop a local strategic plan
 - d) What are the priorities for multi-watershed grant projects potentially implemented by state partners (e.g., OSU PSEP)
5. Scope of issues addressed in PSPs
- a) Should the program focus more on groundwater in addition to surface water?
 - a. Yes, if data from DEQ's groundwater assessment activities indicate a problem and the area scores high enough using the scoring system.
 - b. Experience in WA has shown that groundwater pesticide concerns aren't on par with surface water concerns. However, groundwater data can demonstrate the extent of pesticide fate and transport, even at low levels. Like sediment, don't need to monitor GW as frequently as surface water.
6. Continuous improvement/data driven decisions
- a) When the program is operating in a watershed and seeing persistent pesticide and water quality problems, what are some steps the program and local partners should consider to improve outcomes?
 - b) What are the other questions that we should be evaluating that are measures of effectiveness?
 - c) When we see improvements, how do we know that they are truly improvements rather than switching to chemistries that we do not have tests for?

- d) How much program resources and effort should be expended for moderate vs high priority detections? (Note: if we find low levels of a pesticide but high detection frequencies, it would be considered a moderate priority)
 - e) How should the program account for new chemistries, new pests, and new formulations?
7. Closing or change in status of PSP areas
- a) When do we declare a PSP area "done"? What criteria do we use? What role should the level of stakeholder engagement play in the decision to close an area?
 - b) Are there ever circumstances when we should take another look at an area that has been declared "done"? (i.e. a new pest moves into the area)
 - c) When should we discontinue maintenance monitoring in an area that is in maintenance mode?
 - d) When should we declare an area in maintenance mode?
8. Stakeholder, partner, and pesticide user engagement
- a) Are there changes that we should be making in how we communicate, in addition to the changes we have recently made?
 - b) How do we handle a situation where some key local partners are not engaged?
 - c) What are the holes/gaps in our stakeholder engagement efforts (may vary by PSP area)?
 - d) In addition to the existing support that we provide to local partners, are there any other types of assistance that the program could provide given the resources that we have? Are there other partners/resources who we could explore leveraging, for example OSU Extension?
 - a. PSP data PPT module that agency water quality & pesticide staff can deliver during winter trainings; as well as short talking points that can be shared during agency updates at winter meetings (including annual meetings, recertification trainings, etc). What we are finding and what applicators can do.
 - e) What outreach and education strategies have led to meaningful changes in practice and behavior, and have correlated with improvements in water quality?
 - f) How should educational, outreach and training efforts in specific PSPs be documented? How do we/should we document who has been a recipient of these efforts and how many people have been reached?
 - g) What strategies have not been effective? (can vary by location)
9. Strategic planning
- a) How should the state level strategic plan be integrated with the local strategic plans that groups are developing?
 - a. State level plan - high-level, could use similar format to ODA strategic plan that describes how we conduct our work
 - b. Local plans - more detailed, action plans

b) If an area doesn't want to create a strategic plan, should they be a PSP area?

10. Waste collection events

- a) Should we place limits on a single container size that is acceptable to bring to waste collection events?
- b) Should the Waste Pesticide Collection activities be limited to commercial pesticide applicators and growers and pesticide dealers that have "take back" material from their customers?
- c) Should the Waste Pesticide Collection activities discontinue acceptance of triple rinsed plastic pesticide containers?

DRAFT