

Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

DATE	LOCATION	START TIME	END TIME
10/11/2022	Hybrid	1:00 pm	3:00 pm

FACILITATOR	CONTACT EMAIL	CONTACT PHONE
Isaak Stapleton	isaak.stapleton@oda.oregon.gov	503.986.4713

SAG Members and Guests Present

Jenny Dresler – Oregon Farm Bureau Federation
Lisa Arkin – Beyond Toxics, PSP Member
Jeff Stone – Executive Director for Oregon Association of Nurseries, Integrated Pest Management Interest
Thomas Wittington – Oregon Department of Forestry, Water Quality Pesticide Management Team
Tara Patten – Walla Walla Watershed Council, sitting in for Troy
Katie Murray – Executive Director of Oregonians for Food & Shelter
Kaci Buhl – Associate Professor of Practice at OSU, Outreach and Education
Rebecca Anthony – Oregon Fish & Wildlife, Water Quality Pesticide Management Team
Eugene Foster – DEQ Water Quality, Management Watershed, PSP Coordination
Todd Hudson – Toxicologist Oregon Health Authority & Environmental Health Assessment, Water Quality Pesticide
Karen Lewotsky – Oregon Environmental Council,
Tiffany Monroe – Oregonians for Food & Shelter
Samantha Thomas – Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pesticide License
Kathryn Rifenburg – Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pesticide Partnership Coordinator
David Gruen – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Columbia River Coordinator, partner DEQ
Gilbert Uribe – Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pesticides Program Manager
Isaak Stapleton – Oregon Department of Agriculture, NRPA Program Manager/Director

Introduction

Meeting is called to order by Isaak Stapleton to begin introductions of staff and guests.

Pesticide Staff Changes

Gilbert Uribe – ODA Pesticide Program Manager

There have been staff changes with Rose retiring and me stepping into that role moving forward. I have a background with ODA's Organic Certification Program, was a Product Registration and Licensing Specialist before that. I also worked on Worker Protection Standard outreach efforts. I spent several years with OSU Extension as Education Program Assistant for Nursery Plant Health Programs.

Stakeholder Advisory Group scope, purpose, and membership

Isaak Stapleton – ODA Program Manager/Director

Rose retired and will be coming back to work on some special projects at ODA on a part-time, limited basis. Rose is currently not on staff right now, so not with us today. Isaak requested for any questions regarding Gilbert or staff changes. I wanted to touch base on post COVID, talking about

ROUGH DRAFT

the scope and purpose as well as membership of the SAG Committee, wanting to refresh and revitalize the group. It was started originally in 2019 to do some initial work around a strategic plan for the PSP Program. That work was done, and as the pandemic went on, some people have made some changes and participation has been waned. How can we keep this group strong moving forward and making sure that the agencies participate and the partner members are getting what they want from this interaction? There is a charter that was started for SAG at one point, Jeff Stone was asked if he had any recall on that, which he did not remember much. I want to make sure that the membership we have is diverse and well representative of all those impacted by the PSP Program. Next steps would be for management team to discuss and bring back to the group as a scope for final version of charter. Jeff came in and said it was mainly about accountability being present. Any initial thoughts? Katie Murray steps in with a question regarding if there is a current version that could be shared with everyone. I do not believe there was a final version, Kathryn Rifenburg is working on a draft. Katie Murray thinks it might help to have the starting point. It may have been agreed upon in 2018/2019. I also want to touch on how to make the advisory group beneficial for the agencies and those participating. The group here at ODA has tried to figure out how to plan and coordinate materials to participants ahead of time so they do not come into this meeting with no outline. I am requesting feedback, or improvements that would like to be seen, or concerns? Jeff Stone steps in and states that Katie Murray's point about having an outline for the program would be helpful. Jeff Stone is glad they are not doing the 18 million trust falls from way back when. He wants agencies to be bare empires and working lands. He is interested in hearing about the group. Katie Murray jumps in and says recent discussions and feedbacks, she feels the advisory group was to serve as a function and the advisory term has fallen. Not serving guidance or advice back to the program. She speaks personally, she would like to see this group renamed, instead of SAG. I believe there is a balance and struggle between the agencies for decisions for guiding and directing the program. I do not believe this group was made to make those decisions, more of an advisory group. Katie Murray would like to add that based on her understanding, there has been some decisions being made that were bringing up some red flags for some of the partners of this program. That is why this group started and should be the function of this program. Karen Lewotsky steps in and says it is felt like she is seeing conversations happening at a number of natural resource agencies and revisiting programs and ideas of what an advisory committee is. Who should be included? What is the real goal? How to achieve these outcomes the program is designed to achieve. There is a limited but important role for how things were done. With the whole new group of people, it might be a good time to do a refresh instead of back tasking. There are new goals, issues, and partners. There are new pests and invasive species. Can't do it the way we used to do it. Lisa agrees with Karen. We need to understand the original goals and revisit those in light of the new realities, and making sure the group is helping agencies move forward. We are in a new reality. We should reevaluate moving forward. Katie Murray adds once more, that a lot of these concerns still seem to be present from prior. This advisory group should have a meaningful advisory role. As we think of work ahead, let's bring those up to the agency and management team for future meetings. Karen Lewotsky adds that she thinks she needs a refresh and thinks other people would agree. She is hoping after this meeting, there will still be a window of opportunity to bring up concerns that can be brought up again with the group later on. Giving feedback is a high value and hopes we keep that door open. Should there be a presentation for the group? There was one done in 2019. Is that wanted again? Karen Lewotsky thinks bringing everyone to the same level is important. Setting a basis for understanding of what the program is, is an important place to start. Would people be willing to meet prior to next meeting in Spring? The Board of Ag has asked the PSP to come present a PSP101 in November at the next Ag meeting. Jeff Stone would like the material sent to the group.

[Biennium report: structure, content, and major results](#)

Kathryn Rifenburg - Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pesticide Partnership Coordinator

David and I started putting together the biennium report from 2020/2021. I was in charge of writing the outreach and education that really did not change at all. It was all curved by the pandemic. Everything was put on hold or held virtually. We did do 26 virtual meetings between DEQ, ODA, and OSU Extension. We also did 4 collection events. We usually try to hit 6 every biennium. But we still collected 46,000 lbs in pesticides.

David Gruen – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Columbia River Coordinator, partner DEQ

Biennium report is from 2019-2021 fiscal year. Kathryn and I are both fairly new. This report has taken us some time to put together due to complexities from COVID and going back over what was done over the last couple years. I took over the responsibility of writing up the data analysis section. I want to highlight the major change for structural change on how we analyze the data. It doesn't make sense to evaluate both water quality or sediment data on a fiscal year as we would miss half the growing season. I have conducted the data over a 3 year period in a way that allows us to merge the data from the previous biennium report. I have looked all the whole calendar year for 2019-2021. Comparing the 2017/2018 data as well. It is important to track those activities even if out of the fiscal year. Jeff Stone steps in and is more concerned about growing years and not fiscal years. What if very rainy following a heat wave? How is that accounted for? He is glad the pesticide program is taking care of old and expired chemicals/pesticides. Different years have different growing conditions and climate changes. I agree that it is important to capture data from a whole growing season. Drought and wet periods can provide additional context for data. I think when we think back to the wet spring, we would consider how that might affect and impact the data. I think discussing periods of drought has higher concentration and how that affects our system. We would expect more concentration than if wetter in the streets. Flow measurements could be added to this puzzle based on the conditions. There are some constraints with using load data vs concentration and becomes difficult from a methodology stand point. There is not enough data that represents the hydro graph and resulting conditions in the stream to make a defensible estimate of annual flowing

rates. Katie Murray steps in and says the next report has 2019 included in the report even though it was included in the one before. It is more appropriate to use calendar year basis vs fiscal. The last report was cut off in the middle at July 1. The late summer and fall was not evaluated in the last biennium report. I would like to move forward using the full calendar year. By including 2019, the two compared results, the differences are a result of the 2017-2018 report. It is not defensible to cut off the data in the mid summer because it falls in the fiscal year schedule. The water quality and sediment data is better aligned to a calendar year to make sense of the data. Gilbert Uribe steps in to verify what was just stated. Analysis includes comparison of detection frequency for top 27 selected. There is more than 130 different analytes. They are detected at very low frequencies or not at all. The most commonly detected are focused on from the last report. I also detailed the top 30 in the current report to compare. What is being detected more frequently? Using the top 27 provide detection frequencies, exceedances of water quality criteria to evaluate pesticide levels on communities. We have 12 plus years of data to do a trend analysis that looks at concentrations over a 10 or 8 year period. The 8 year period is for the 2014/2015 year. We conducted 10 year trend test for a particular season by month. It is more powerful and looks at differences across the seasons. It looks for particular analyte and compares those to other January values for example. It would not compare to June due to time of year. This is a strong basis test being used by USGS, so not something novel for evaluating trends in environmental data. We also provided look back at sediment sampling from 2020. We can use that to evaluate sediment toxicity units. We can use this data for high or moderate concern. How often a pesticide is detected and how often the detection exceeds aquatic life benchmark. I have been working with DEQ water quality analyst for R scripts that can be more quickly run next time. Hoping to set out a format structure, it will be much faster to develop this report in the upcoming cycle. Kathryn Rifenburg states the current plan is to finalize report at next water quality management team meeting and have it available to the public shortly after October 20th. Katie Murray steps in to ask about detection frequency from last time vs this time and isolating out the top 30. The data tool relies on percentages of frequencies and not number of detections. Is that connected back to some level? Or is it just relying on that detection? It is important to look at number of detections and not just percent. We do incorporate that in the biennium report and the data table.

PSP Partner Grants

Kathryn Rifenburg - Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pesticide Partnership Coordinator

Letters were sent out to partners on September 15th and there has been some significant changes to grant processes and grant applications. We are no longer funding proposals that only have a monitoring component. Every application we fund needs to have an education component and has to be based on water quality data based on the previous biennium data. All projects composed have to have clear and measurable goals and with the grant application also came annual report and final report template that has specific metrics and numbers, what we are looking for specifically. We have moved away from a varied amount for water quality monitoring. The amount funding varies widely based on staff hourly rates and how far everyone is driving. The partners less funded and needed more resource, were requesting less money. For more equitable results, we went to a flat fee per sample, \$55 per sample. We are not asking partners to take flow measurements. The method for collection to flow data varied across partners. We are looking for more accuracy towards data. DEQ has committed to finding a better way to calculate flow data for next biennium. I have tried to stream line processes and feedback previously was that it was confusing on who to contact and I have sent entire application package that specifies what we will and won't fund. The original deadline was November 15th but feedback from partners said that is too soon, so it has been moved to March 1st. It should not slow things down or reduce funding. David Gruen steps in and says he is committed to finding best solution to flow. Questions are asked regarding the process or anything anyone wants to bring up. Lisa Arkin asked which grants have been received for the last grant cycle and the success/outcomes. We don't have any final reports from partners until after the biennium is over, likely sometime in August. Karen Lewotsky steps with a random comment. Says there has been a lot of discussion at this meeting, and it would have been more easily followed if we had documents in front of us or documents on the screen to follow. Following a technical process without prompts to help guide can be really challenging and wanting more support for these meetings. As we talk more about this group, she would like to feel the opportunity to look at materials ahead of time so there is an opportunity to engage around data. Isaak Stapleton is happy to receive this type of feedback and agrees walking into a meeting without prep materials can make participation more difficult. Jenny Dreslet echoes the comment Karen Lewotsky made.

Adjourn

Isaak Stapleton adjourns the meeting and will follow up with presentation for the board and the original draft charter. Kathryn Rifenburg will be sending out the list of awardees from last biennium.

