

2011 WSSA Science Policy Committee Report

Committee Code and Name: (E2) Washington Science Policy Committee (SPC)

Committee Chair: Donn Shilling

Board Coordinator: Mike Barrett

Committee Members Rotating Off: John Jachetta; **Appropriate Replacement:** Mike Barrett

Members: APMS: SPC representative: John Madsen
NCWSS: President-elect: Brian Young
NEWSS: WSSA representative: Jacob Barney
SWSS: SPC representative: Donn Shilling
WSWS: SPC Representative: John Brock
WSSA: President – Mike Barrett, Past President- John Jachetta, President-elect- Rod Lym, VP- Jim Kells, At-Large: Jill Schroeder; Janis McFarland; Harold Coble

Summary of 2010 SPC and Director of Science Policy (DSP) Activities: 1. Generated support for USDA research funding: met with committee staff and wrote coalition letters on behalf of the National and Regional Weed Science Societies; 2. Generated support for NPDES legislative fix bill: met with House and Senate staffers and submitted letters of support; 3. Generated support for Army Corps of Engineers Aquatic Plant Control Research Program: was not successful in getting Rep. Fleming or Goemert to offer an amendment to restore funding; sent letters to all appropriations committee members; 4. Generated support for National Invasive Species Awareness Week activities; 5. Supported Public Awareness Committee activities and responded to press inquiries; 6. Continued educating agency and NGO stakeholders on herbicide resistance management.

Also see attachment 1- DSP report

The DSP and committee member were active with many other issues on a continuous basis in 2010. The WSSA and the SPC chairman also dealt with the funding formula for the DSP. The SWSS asked the WSSA BOD to provide detail information on how each regional society and APMS financially support the DSP. The formula used to bill the regional societies annually, the amount of funding in reserve and how the present funding formula will affect the DSP account were all disclosed and discussed. As a result of this discussion, the formula to fund the DSP was decreased to adjust for reduced DSP costs. The Chairman of the WSSA SPC traveled to the summer SWSS Board meeting to discuss this issue in detail: see following minutes.

Summer SWSS Board Meeting with Chairman of SWSS Legislative and Regulatory committee and WSSA Science Policy Committee Chairman, Donn Shilling – 6/24/2010 San Juan, PR

The Chairman of the SWSS Legislative and Regulatory Committee, Donn Shilling was asked to comment on the WSSA Director of Science Policy to the Board. The primary issue was the formula used to fund the

DSP. Each regional weed science society contributes to DSP; however, the amount contributed and the formula used was investigated and ultimately changed.

Comments by Donn Shilling to the Board

Thank you. I'm here as chair of WSSA SPC and SWSS Legislative and Regulatory Committees. I believe, as many do, that representation for weed science in Washington is essential. -Today's scientists are increasingly engaged in "scientific translation." Society wants to increasingly drive policy using scientifically based information. As a science-based organization, SWSS needs to be proactive by providing transparent access, through the DSP, to science based information that drives policy. The DSP is our voice in Washington. Public & private organizations must know we want to be engaged and the best way to convey this message is to support a full-time advocate in Washington. There are many examples of how the DSP has served the interests of Weed Science and SWSS:

-AFRI

-no section in 1st RFP for weed science

-DSP set up a series of meetings with Beachy and others in NIFA

-we have been assured that weed science will have a section in future granting opportunities

-we will continue to work with Beachy & staff to elevate awareness of weed science

-DSP will let us know when weed science positions in Washington are available – worked hard to maintain ARS NPL for weed science

-EPA – Jill Schroder, Kurk Getsinger and DSP worked directly with EPA to develop, modify & implement regulations

-DSP helped coordinate trip to Florida with EPA personnel to show them the importance of herbicides & how existing regulations are sufficient

-many other examples of DSP coordinating information flow

-see DSP reports

-Discussed funding formula to support DSP

-2 previous funding formulas – last one developed for previous DSP

-3rd formula being proposed now to adjust for reduced costs

-total DSP costs = \$121,000 for 2010

-10-year plan

-\$121,000 + 4%increase/year – this will cover annual costs & draw down escrow account

-new plan can be reassessed every 3 years

-WSSA contributes 65%

-Regionals contribute 35% (SWSS 8%)

-Escrow account high due to Rob Hedberg (previous DSP) leaving

-\$235,000

-SWSS cost go down by 1/3 with new plan (\$10,802 from \$16,000)

Recommendations

-Donn Shilling recommended the SWSS Board support the new funding plan & continue support for the DSP

-enhance communication in between DSP & SWSS

-SWSS president

-invite DSP to present at SWSS annual plenary session

-meet w/SWSS board

-SWSS newsletter editor request report from DSP

Conclusion

All organizations are made up of people, including Washington bureaucracy. Ideas and decisions are based on conversations. Sometimes huge issues are decided one way or the other based on a simple conversation – intentional or accidental. Conversations concerning weed science occur on a continuous basis in Washington. We need the DSP so that we, as professionals, are in the conversation.

2010 WSSA Science Policy Committee meeting:

WSSA Science Policy Committee Meeting
Monday, February 7, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon
Forum Room, Hilton Portland and Executive Tower Hotel

Attendees

Name	Phone	Email	Organization
Donn Shilling	706-542-2461	dgs@uga.edu	UGA
Jill Schroeder	575-646-2328	jschroe@nmsu.edu	NMSU
Jacob Barney	540-449-7775 (cell)	jnbarney@vt.edu	Virginia Tech
Lee Van Wychen	202-746-4686	lee.vanwychen@wsss.net	WSSA
Michael Barrett	859-229-1502	mbarrett@uky.edu	WSSA, UK
Bryan Young	618-453-7679	bgyoung@siv.edu	S Ill University
Hilary Sandler	508-295-2212 x21	hsandler@umext.umass.edu	UMass Cranberry
John Jachetta	317-337-4686	jjjachetta@dow.com	Dow AgroScience
Janis McFarland	336-707-5873 (cell)	janis.mcfarland@syngenta.com	Syngenta

AGENDA

1. Discussion of “on-going” issues
 - a. NPDES Permits
 - b. USDA Research Funding
 - i. NIFA AFRI
 - ii. Smith-Lever, Hatch Act, Formula Funds
 - iii. Section 406- CAR, RAMP, Regional IPM Centers
 - c. Herbicide Resistance Education and Outreach
 - i. APHIS I – Vencill group white paper
 - ii. APHIS II – Shaw group white paper
 - iii. Herbicide Mode of Action Labeling
 - iv. “Superweed” Hearings
 - d. National Invasive Species Awareness Week
 - e. Healthy Habitats Coalition
2. Setting Priorities for 2011
3. 2011 Science Policy Committee Conference Call Dates
 - a. May 18
 - b. Aug. 17
 - c. Nov. 16
 - d. All calls at 4 pm EST
 - i. 1-800-377-8846
 - ii. Pass: 79695424#
4. Other topics/issues
 - a. SPD evaluation – see attachment 2 - evaluation form

WSSA Science Policy Committee meeting minutes:

02-07-2011

-Mike Barrett and Donn Shilling will check on WSSA by-laws to determine how the regional societies appoints representatives to WSSA SP Committee. This was determine and is reflected in the committee membership at the beginning of the report—note each member’s professional title is included which reflects the appropriate representation for each participating society.

-Barbara Glenn – made comments

-discussed how committee works & how DSP is funded

-AFRI panel selection

-David Shaw reported on a National Summit on herbicide resistance management

-biomass-invasive plants discussion

Priorities for DSP:

1. Resistance
2. NPDES
3. AFRI/formula
4. Army Corps – Aquatic weed funding
5. IPNI funding
6. Bioenergy – invasive

WSSA BOD meeting with Science Policy Committee chairman, Donn Shilling

1. Donn Shilling discussed the new SPD evaluation form—see attachment 2 and the first utilization of the form.
2. Discussed SPD's performance for 2010 evaluation
3. BOD recommendations:
 - a) Increase interaction with other scientific societies
 - b) Work with SPD to enhance professional development
 - c) Continue to enhance communication DSP activities to members

2011 Committee Plan-of-action recommendations to DSP: 1. Continue to generate support for USDA research funding and fight against the closure of more ARS research labs; 2. Continue to generate support for NPDES legislative fix bill: this bill could be a rider on the debt limit increase bill; 3. Continue to generate support for Army Corps of Engineers Aquatic Plant Control Research Program: will need another round of letters and visits on Capitol Hill; 4. Generate support for the EPA Pesticide Safety Education Program; 5. Finish the reporting and funds request paperwork for the APHIS II paper on Herbicide Resistance Management; 6. Planning and organization of National Invasive Species Awareness Week with National Invasive Species Council; 7. Continued herbicide resistance management education of agency and NGO stakeholders: tour in Illinois and Missouri, National Academies summit in November; 8. Investigate Beachy Coalition proposal.

Recommendations for Board/Society Action: Provide funding to support:

- a) professional development training for DSP
- b) DSP activities.

Continue to support the activities of the DSP and help coordinate all our efforts to enhance the impact of WSSA on national and regional policies that impact our membership.

What information was posted on the WSSA website? Reports were posted to the WSSA Website at <http://www.wssa.net/WSSA/SciPolicy/SciPolicyReports.htm> and provided to the regional and APMS newsletters. The quarterly meetings of the WSSA SPC are transcribed and will be posted to the WSSA website.

Funds requested? \$5000 is the committee's historical budget allocation. We recommend an additional \$2,000 for professional development training for SPD. Continue to support the WSSA contributions to the DSP as well as the contributions from APMS and the regional Weed Science Societies.

Attachment 1

WASHINGTON REPORT July 2011

FY 2012 Funding for USDA Programs Nosedives

The House passed its FY 2012 agriculture appropriations bill on June 16, 2011 by a vote of 217-203. The Senate has yet to take action on its version of the FY 2012 agriculture appropriations. Most agencies and programs saw double digit reductions in their FY 2012 appropriations from the House compared to FY 2011. The only bright spot was getting the Regional IPM Centers funding boosted from \$3 million to \$4 million. The House Ag Approps Committee “concur” with the USDA-ARS proposal to close 10 research facilities in the following locations: Fairbanks, Alaska; Shafter, California; Brooksville, Florida; Watkinsville, Georgia; New Orleans, Louisiana; Coshocton, Ohio; Lane, Oklahoma; Clemson, South Carolina; Weslaco, Texas; and Beaver, West Virginia. The Committee provides the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to transfer a closed facility to an 1862, 1890, 1994 or Hispanic-serving agricultural college or university provided the institution agrees to maintain the facility for agricultural and natural resources research for a minimum of 25 years.

<u>USDA Program Description</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2012 House</u>	<u>Change 11- 12</u>
	Dollars in Thousands			Percent
Agricultural Research Service	\$1,179,639	\$1,133,230	\$993,345	-12.3%
Economic Research Service	\$82,478	\$81,814	\$70,000	-14.4%
National Ag Statistics Service	\$161,830	\$156,447	\$149,500	-4.4%
National Institute of Food Agriculture	\$788,243	\$698,740	\$600,800	-14.0%
- Hatch Act	\$215,000	\$236,334	\$208,000	-12.0%
- Cooperative Forestry Research	\$29,000	\$32,934	\$30,000	-8.9%
- Improved Pest Management & Biological Control	\$16,185	\$16,153	\$14,000	-13.3%
- Ag and Food Research Initiative	\$262,482	\$264,470	\$229,500	-13.2%
- Extension Activities	\$494,923	\$479,132	\$411,200	-14.2%
- Smith Lever	\$297,500	\$293,911	\$259,200	-11.8%
- Integrated Activities	\$60,022	\$36,926	\$8,000	-78.3%
- Section 406	\$45,148	\$29,000	\$8,000	-72.4%
- Regional IPM Centers	\$4,096	\$3,000	\$4,000	33.3%
- FQPA Risk Mitigation	\$4,388	\$0	\$0	0%

(RAMP)				
- Crops affected by FQPA (CAR)	\$1,365	\$0	\$0	0%
- Methyl Bromide Transitions	\$3,054	\$2,000	\$0	-100%
- Organic Transitions	\$5,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	0%
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Serv. (APHIS)	\$904,953	\$863,270	\$790,000	-8.5%

Within the National Institute of Food Agriculture (NIFA), the House Ag Approps Committee “regrets it cannot provide an increase for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative for fiscal year 2012. While the committee appreciates the work of the dedicated staff of NIFA, especially for their efforts to reorganize the agency and raise the profile of agricultural research as directed by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, it is concerned about some of the research being funded by the agency. For example, the agency recently awarded more than \$23 million in grants to improve regional and local food systems. Over the past few years, numerous reports from Federal agencies and private philanthropic and scientific organizations have highlighted the need for the United States to invest in agricultural research, particularly to ensure productivity growth and to develop and refine sound natural resources management practices for U.S. farmers and ranchers and others around the world. In light of this advice and the nation’s serious budget deficit and debt problems, the agency should be focusing its research efforts on only the highest priority, scientifically merited research. While there are many interesting research topics and a multitude of issues that could be researched, the Committee expects the agency to focus on its core mission of agricultural research by setting a very high standard for research funded by the agency and requiring a rigorous peer review.” I hope the Senate Ag Approps Committee shows a little more understanding of the value of agricultural research when they mark up their version of the ag appropriations bill.

Aquatic Plant Control Research Program

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Civil Works) has proposed to eliminate the Aquatic Plant Control Research Program (APCRP) in the FY 2012 budget. This is the nation’s only federally authorized program for research and development of science-based management strategies for invasive aquatic weeds. We are asking the Army Corps of Engineers and Congress to restore funding to \$4 million for FY 2012. The Corps’ APCRP expertise and importance was on full display at a recent Congressional field hearing on efforts to control and eradicate giant salvinia. [The June 27th field hearing](#) was organized by Rep. John Fleming (LA-04) and held at Louisiana State University in Shreveport. Dr. Michael Grodowitz, Biomanagement Team Leader for the Army Corps of Engineers was called on to testify at the hearing. I’d also like to recognize fellow weed scientists, Dr. Randy Westbrook, Dr. Dearl Sanders, and Dr. Damon Waitt for their testimony on behalf of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, chaired by Rep. Fleming. The Aquatic Plant Control Research Program funds the work of Dr. Michael Grodowitz, along with 18 other aquatic plant management researchers. But with APCRP slated to be zeroed out in FY 2012, we will lose the expertise and institutional knowledge of all of the Army Corps’ invasive aquatic plant management researchers. This is simply unacceptable. We understand that the country is in fiscally tough times and everyone has to take some cuts and make some sacrifices. But, we are strongly opposed to eliminating the entire Army Corps Aquatic Plant Control Research Program! I will need your help to convince Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Jo-Ellen

Darcy, and Congress about the value of the APCRP. Expect an email from WSSA President Barrett in the near future asking for your support of APCRP.

Program of Research on the Economics of Invasive Species (PREISM)

The 2011 workshop of the USDA Economic Research Service's Program of Research on the Economics of Invasive Species (PREISM) was held on May 17, 2011 in Washington, D.C. The workshop was a collaboration between USDA-ERS and the Farm Foundation, NFP. The presentations from the workshop are available on the Farm Foundation website at:

<http://www.farmfoundation.org/webcontent/2011-PREISM-Workshop-1740.aspx?a=1740&z=91&>

National Invasive Species Awareness Week – Feb. 28 – Mar. 4, 2011

I am excited that Lori Williams and the National Invasive Species Council (NISC) have taken the lead to organize the 2nd all taxa NISAW. NISC was established by Executive Order 13112 to ensure that Federal programs and activities to prevent and control invasive species are coordinated, effective and efficient. NISC members are the Secretaries and Administrators of 13 federal departments and agencies to provide high-level coordination on invasive species. NISC is co-chaired by the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, and the Interior. This has provided a much more "cleaner" education and awareness event while allowing us access to federal dollars and resources previously unavailable.

NISAW will kick off at the Department of the Interior on Monday morning. As part of the NISAW week of events and held in conjunction with NC-FAR's Hill Seminar Series, the WSSA is hosting Dr. Richard Mack from Washington State who will be giving a seminar at the House Ag Committee on Monday at 12 noon titled "Waging War on Invasive Plants: Preventing - Not just Controlling – Rangeland Fires in the West".

On Tuesday, there will be a full day State and Regional Invasive Species Workshop at the Dupont Hotel. The main objectives are to: 1) Provide opportunity for state officials, industry, NGO's and federal officials to discuss specific invasive species issues and explore ways to overcome barriers to cooperation in preventing and controlling IS; 2) Explore ways to enhance state and regional coordination through communication, partnerships, sharing expertise and resources and setting state and regional priorities; and 3) Share success stories and best practices about invasive species projects and programs so that those models can be replicated across broader areas.

There are evening receptions at the National Aquarium at the Department of Commerce on Monday and at the US Botanic Gardens on Capitol Hill on Wednesday. Many thanks to Dow AgroSciences and Syngenta for sponsoring the US Botanic Garden Reception.

There will be other invasive species groups in DC that week which have major events scheduled including the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the Great Lakes Coalition. On Thursday, there will be a USDA and ITAP invasive species programs at the Dupont Hotel and Friday will wrap up the week with planning for NISAW 2012.

www.NISAW.org

USDA personnel changes

- Dr. Sheryl Kunickis took over as Director of the USDA Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP) for Al Jennings. OPMP was established in 1997 and is responsible for: (a) integrating USDA programs and strategic planning pertaining to pest management; (b) coordinating

USDA's role in the pesticide regulatory process and related interagency affairs, primarily with EPA; and (c) strengthening USDA's support for agriculture by helping to develop alternative pest management tools that may be needed as a result of regulatory change.

- Dr. Catherine Woteki became USDA's Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics and Chief Scientist. She replaced Raj Shah who left for US-AID. She is a political appointee like Beachy, but her tenure is linked to the current Administration whereas Beachy is there for a 6 year appointment as Director of NIFA. Woteki served as the first Under Secretary for Food Safety at USDA in the 1990's and worked for two years in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy under Clinton. From 2002-2005, Woteki was dean of agriculture and professor of human nutrition at Iowa State University, where she also was the head of the Agriculture Experiment Station.

USDA-NIFA funds Weed Science Research

Thank you to everyone for your help and support in this effort over the past year! The AFRI Foundational Grant Program for "Plant Health and Production and Plant Products" will have four priority areas in 2011 where \$23 million will be awarded. The four areas are: 1) Biology of Agricultural Plants; 2) Understanding Plant-Associated Microorganisms; 3) Controlling Weedy and Invasive Plants; and 4) Insects and Nematodes. **Letter of Intent Deadline – March 16, 2011** (5:00 p.m. ET). I expect that approximately \$5 million will be available for "Controlling Weedy and Invasive Plants", which will be led by USDA National Program Leader Dr. Michael Bowers, mbowers@nifa.usda.gov. This priority area will support projects that focus on improving our understanding of relationships between agronomic practices and the evolution, spread, and subsequent dynamics of herbicide resistance based on an understanding of ecological fitness and gene flow in weed populations and use of ecological processes, including integrated pest management, to manage and control weedy and invasive species. Details: http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/rfas/pdfs/11_afri_foundationalL_final_1-7-11.pdf

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits (NPDES)

Many thanks to Jill Schroeder for organizing an excellent tour in New Mexico to educate EPA staff on the proposed effects of implementing an NPDES permit system. The WSSA wants to ensure that FIFRA remains the preeminent federal law for pesticide regulation that protects both people and the environment. The extensive research and science-based risk assessments required by FIFRA should not be jeopardized by political agendas or bad judges. EPA has until April 9, 2011 to implement an NPDES permit system for all pesticides applied in, over, or near water. The permits' complex compliance requirements will impose tremendous new burdens on thousands of small businesses, farms, communities, counties, and state and federal agencies legally responsible for pest control, and exposing them to legal jeopardy through citizen suits over paperwork violations. The permit includes unrealistic deadlines for state delegated implementation and compliance, and it has become abundantly clear that many states will not meet the court ordered implementation date of April 9, 2011. Even at this late date, EPA has yet to release a final permit. Moreover, pesticide users will not have time to fully understand or come into compliance with the permits by the deadline, thus increasing their liability even more. I am working with other coalitions such as CropLife America to ask Congress to take action before the permits become final. I will be circulating a letter to Congress for the National and Regional Weed Science Societies to endorse in the coming weeks. There will be a hearing conducted by the House Agriculture Committee on this issue in the near future. I will discuss the Congressional outlook of a legislative fix.

We need your help to make sure H.R. 872 passes the Senate. H.R. 872 ensures that pesticide applications over or near water are regulated through the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and fixes some misguided court decisions that have resulted in a duplicative and costly National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. On March 31, the House passed H.R. 872 by a vote of 292-130. On June 21, Senate Ag Committee passed H.R. 872 without any amendments. Nineteen of the 21 Senators on the Committee supported the bill. Currently, Sen. Cardin from Maryland has placed a hold on the bill. By placing a hold on the bill, Cardin blocks the measure from coming to the floor for passage under unanimous consent. Under Senate practice, it would take 60 votes to break the hold. This is where you come in! Hopefully you have received an email on this issue from President Barrett. Please ask your Senators to support H.R. 872. Please click here: [Take action on NPDES legislation](#). It only takes a minute!

Spray Drift Labeling.

Last year EPA proposed new spray drift language for FIFRA labels which had many problems. Vague language such as “could cause” or “may cause” adverse effects does not belong on a pesticide label because it is not in accordance with the FIFRA risk-based standard of ‘no unreasonable adverse effects’. I submitted comments on behalf of the WSSA, the American Phytopathological Society and the Entomology Society of America Plant-Insect Section in March. EPA received over 35,000 comments on their proposed pesticide drift label changes and will be moving forward with their modified language in the next six months. It is my understanding that they have addressed some of our concerns, but will be monitoring this closely. We also organized a symposium on improvements in spray drift reduction technologies at both EPA and American Farm Bureau that was conducted by Bob Wolf from Kansas State.

Herbicide Resistance Management Policy

WSSA members Bill Vencill, Carol Mallory-Smith, Bill Johnson, Nilda Burgos, Ted Webster, Bob Nichols, and John Soteres have been working on a “state of the science” review paper on the development of herbicide-resistant weeds and weed shifts that are linked to the introduction of GE herbicide-tolerant corn, soybeans, wheat, rice, cotton, alfalfa and switchgrass. The goal is publish the review paper via “open access” in *Weed Science*.

In October, Jill Schroeder, WSSA-EPA Liaison, helped coordinate a learning session on herbicide resistance management in Washington DC. David Shaw, WSSA President, gave presentation to EPA-OPP and CropLife America in October that discussed results after 3rd year of 4-yr, 6 state study that showed that net returns on fields managed according to recommended best practices are equal to or greater than the returns on those where glyphosate is used alone. WSSA recommendations include focused educational efforts that target all appropriate groups including media, growers, dealers/distributors, and consultants. We need to convey a consistent, accurate message about managing herbicide resistance and it must be urgent. Discussions about herbicide mode-of-action labeling is on the table with EPA.

Lee Van Wychen, Ph.D.
Science Policy Director

Attachment 2

ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR WSSA SCIENCE POLICY DIRECTOR

Developed 12/13/2010

Please answer questions 1-5 using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
lowest				highest

1. Did the Director of Science Policy (DSP) follow through on what you believe to be important WSSA activities?

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

additional comments:

2. Did the DSP have positive impacts on WSSA?

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

additional comments:

3. Did the DSP function in a professional and effective manner?

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

additional comments:

4. How would you rank the overall job performance of the DSP?

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

additional comments:

5. Did the WSSA Science Policy Committee (SPC) effectively develop appropriate activities for the DSP?

1 2 3 4 5

additional comments:

Please provide concise responses:

6. How can we improve the effectiveness of the DSP?

7. How can we improve the effectiveness of the SPC?

8. How can we enhance the impact of WSSA in Washington?

9. Please provide any additional comments.