

WSSA Science Policy Committee  
Quarterly conference call  
June 9, 2010

Hilary Sandler  
John Jachetta  
Jill Schroeder  
Tom Holt  
David Shaw  
Donn Shilling  
Mike Barrett

---

LVW – Ok, Mike, why don't you go ahead, if you wanna just comment a little bit on your trip up here last Tuesday, actually it was Wednesday, for the stakeholders' meeting with NIFA before you drop out of range.

MB – OK. So they had a stakeholders meeting last Tuesday for the AFRI-NIFA program. Um, I think they were happily surprised. They had a pretty small room in a hotel there, and basically it got to be standing room only. I also would mention that I have been part of a group that works on a ??? society, so I had a little bit of insight on where they were going with their comments. Our comments were basically along the line of the early letter that we had sent in with all the regional ??? support and signatures. Basically that weed science had been left out, that there was very little place for weed science to go. So we asked for the same three things. We asked for the first -Teaching, and that was to reestablish a financial program in weed science. Secondly, that the general areas be challenge areas, written less focused to allow more diversity of contribution, particularly science, but also for other disciplines. And then we also asked for the continuation of funding for the ??? program. We also added a few extra other general comments that I think was very much in line with what most other groups were saying. The plan for the NIFA is to go with they call a forward funding. So basically what they're going to do is send all the money they have this year, but also bank the same amount of money for the next more or less 5 years down the road. So they are sending most everything they think that we'd get, and any real??? program they have a pretty small amount held back for these grants next year. They don't get increases. There'll be very few new grants next year and maybe years in the future. So a lot of people expressed concern about that kind of model from many standpoints, so we're pretty much in agreement with them there. There was one other group that felt like they were totally cut out, so they had similar comments to ours. Yeah, it was a day of basically telling the AFRI leadership what that was wrong. Lee and I did have a chance to talk with Dr....for just a few minutes. I think he's definitely feeling, um, he's heard our input. We should be getting a response to our letter to him. And we also send a written, uh, put our comments in after that meeting that we raised some of those points. Probable toned down the, uh, toned it down a little bit as far as the aggressive tone we had in the letter to him, but pretty much came back with the same recommendations. So we should hear something back from them. I don't know if it's going to turn out to be anything positive, but I remain somewhat optimistic that if there is an

expansion, thanks to pressure on resistance weed, all this will come into play, maybe at least identify plant funding for the next RSA/RFA (?). We can only hope. Lee, anything to add to that?

LVW – I really felt fairly encouraged after hearing him, after hearing Dr. ???, the fact that he brought our weed science up specifically in his comments about having heard our message when he was addressing all the stakeholder. And I think they're going to do everything they can to get this right. A lot of their work depends on how much resources they have, but I came away with a really good feeling.

Mike – I would say one thing is we certainly were probably ahead of most of the pack. A lot of the....voicing our issues, uh, hopefully stay ahead. Robert Glen from Crop Science of America also spoke at the meeting last Tuesday, actually basically took up three recommendations. First, awards (?), that he supported those. there were at least one or two other groups that mentioned weed science. So, I thought we came out very well.

??? – I'm very gratified by that. Crop Life actually contacted us and told us that the advocacy program that we've been doing has been very effective. They would have liked a heads-up first, but they'd like to help us, and so I really appreciate their presence.

- MB-One thing I forgot to mention- go ahead.
- Jill or Hillary-Yeah that's great. Actually there's getting a lot of good....just beyond (name mentioned above), just even with some of the grower grants and all.
- LVW - One other point related to that – well first off, we've had a number of other calls. Not only did I get the pass code wrong once, but I got it wrong twice, and I just sent it out again. Roll call- Janice McFarland?, David Shaw, Chris ?, Rod ?, Ann Hutchinson. Anyone else? Ok, we were just discussing the need for funding and priorities, and then move forward to the 2011 RSAs (?). One other note on the upside of having very good response to the-from the Dr....I think he understand it now. You know, there was other key stakeholders or leaders in the room from NIFA, including Meryl ??? and Dr. ????. So, they heard the comments loud and clear, as well, and they have our letters. I'm very hopeful that we will be adjusted for it, included in the 2011 RSAs. They're also talking about, did they say December 1<sup>st</sup> release date of the 2011, Mike?
- MB-Yes. That's what he said. December 1 or January 1 were the two dates that were
- LVW – Normally it's the end of March, so if they do it by December 1, I think it would be fairly shocking, but obviously they're trying to get ahead of the game.
- John-They would be putting out a new request for grant applications? What would happen on December or January 1?
- LVW-This would be whatever has happened with 2010 that was released in March, I mean that's done. However, for the 2011 would be the next cycle, taking in all the stakeholders from that first go-round.
- DGS-Lee, this is Donn. So on December or January 1, are they going to put out proposed or draft areas of emphasis? What exactly will come out at that point?
- LVW-It'll be the final RSA
- DGS-Oh, for this year.
- LVW-No, for 2011.

- DGS-OK
- LVW-Projects that would be in proposal. I would say that vast majority of the stakeholders expressed interest in further working with them and helping develop their RSAs and providing feedback, but they made it very clear that that was not acceptable, that was a conflict of interest, and so they didn't hear comments either through the first part of this year after they released the RSAs, up until the stakeholders meeting. And that's what they're going on for when they develop their 2011 funding proposals.
- They were very clear that they know how to put out the draft and in a lot of ways, I don't blame them.....I guess my question is what else could we do?.....
- DGS-My one thought would be about getting into analyzing the individual skill sets. But NIFAs national program leader for weed science, where is he in these discussions, b/c once we leave the room, he's going to be our advocate, whether we like it or not.
- Well, he wasn't there on Tuesday. He is the national program leader for ....planet change, I think is his charge right now. And so I do not know where he's at, at all.
- DGS-But within his job responsibilities, weed science is – I mean when you look at NIFA and you look for the leadership that weed science has, he's – we have to depend on him to provide the leadership at these follow up meetings that we won't be in? Beyond climate change?
- How this is going to work behind closed doors, I hope we're cultivating other advocates besides the one we're talking about
- DGS-I guess that was what I was asking, Mike, I think I might have gotten a little off the page of what you want to talk about, but as long as you brought up what we need to do next, if we look at .....staff, we know the person that theoretically should be representing our interests. Um, how much are we doing specifically with him to make sure he understands that he has a responsibility to represent us? I assume I've already answered my question, one of the reason we're working with....directly is b/c ya'll know the kind of representation we're going to get. I just thought I'd follow up with your-you brought up the issue< mike, what do we do next? I'm still concerned
- And whether we should go and talk with....or not, I'm unclear on that. I feel like we're no longer under his wings.
- DGS-That's my question, does he still have responsibility for weed science?
- Well, there's no weed science program anymore
- Well, that's my point
- DGS-Well, in the future, what's your perception, Mike? I mean, when they start developing these conversations, they're going to be sitting around brainstorming, and.....will have his own preconceived notion. But assume he's going to want his staff to take some leadership roles and provide advocacy for particular future areas of focus. Um, this individual is the one that's gotta do this for us, is that true?
- No, I don't think that he's the only one in the room that could do that.
- DGS-Ok, Ok
- No, we probably do need to work that angle, and touch base with him, and make sure he knows everything we want to happen and why it should happen./

- DGS-Hey ,let me do a follow up Mike, if you were to sit with a piece of paper and jot down the names of the NIFA staff that would be in these critical meetings where they're strategizing about what their focus areas are going to be, how many people are on that list, and should we think about cultivating a relationship with them, so we have multiple advocates in the room. I guess that's where I'm going with this. Who are those people, and should we try to develop a relationship with them?
- LVW-well, we have had discussions with...who was in town in May.....and Frank is rooted higher up the chain. Another name that-I mean, we're talking probably 6 to 10 people that are making the final cut. Bowers/?? Has said that weed science was in the final round with foundational program.....but I have not been able to verify that one way or the other. But we are kind of stuck with Bowers as our advocate, as a former national program leader for weed science. So it definitely can't hurt to bird dog him and keep on him, 'cause.....several not confrontation, but the way he handles the weed science....invasive species program, uh there's been a lot of question marks about that, and there's not-it's not like we can go out and ask for a change in the program leader, but we just have to keep on him
- No, he's our advocate, you know, that's somebody who has been around weed science for a long time, and he's the individual who's there, so you work with what you've got?
- Janice-I missed the -who do you keep talk about? Which program? Which program
- LVW-Janice, it's Michael Flowers, he 's the national program leader for weed science. That was his title up until this redistribution under NIFA, and right now he's in like the national resources and environment area
- Ok, thanks
- MB-Maybe you ought to respond to Donn's question right now. Maybe he and I could work together, I'm thinking one individual I talked to at the meeting actually a former program leader for weed science. Maybe we'll go through the staff list a little bit and see if there are some contacts there. I probably wouldn't hesitate to call that person up and say, "Could you just explain to me how this is going to work? Are we doing - you know, how do we get a picture of.....most effective." They may tell us they can't say anything. But I'd work with the person on a panel with.... I wouldn't mind calling them.
- DGS-I think that's a good idea, Mike. It's a little more investigation into what the process is, when these key meetings are, who's going to be in the room, so that we can potentially follow up with some of those people, too. And it may end up being only Michael Bowers, but there have to be some other people that we can atleast.....
- MB-Yeah, there's a couple other people we can talk to, maybe not directly involved, but may give up more insight into the process.
- DGS-Yeah, yeah, ok.
- MB-So you want to make a note of that, we'll work on that.
- LVW-This is good, yes, I am going to do an action item for this, and I'll send out Bowers' contact information to everyone on the science policy committee, and if you have a chance to bug about what he's doing for weed science, that's great. Certainly on my end, I'll try to meet with him as frequently as possible

- DGS-But Lee, also work with Mike, just developing a better understanding of the process and the staff people in the room to determine if there's somebody other than Bowers that developing relationship would be useful.
- Alright.
- Lee, could you fill me in where Mike...background.....
- Well, they're creating the institute within the institute basically, so there's the Institute of .....the Institute of Plant and Animal Science....and I think Victor has got moved up a couple slots, I'm not exactly sure what his working title is right now, but he's in the Plant and Animal system group, so certainly Mike is one that will have some say.
- ?????
- LVW-Yeah, Mike is a good one, Mark...is another one. There a little bit down...but that's something that actually was brought up at the WSSA meeting in USDA and NIFA goes through this reorganization, trying to keep the science policy committee up to date on who gets plugged into where and what the command structure looks like. I think that I will try to put together, or atleast pull off the website if they some updated graphics on the organizational structure
- ?????
- LVW-All right, and kind of related to this but and dealing with Jim....position that he is probably going to be retiring sometime this summer or into the fall. So we really don't have anyone in weed science left over there outside Rob....who is heading up their program. And so we brought this up with Crop Life yesterday. Jill Schroeder and Hale Covell??? Were in this meeting. WE also brought her up with the new...pest management policy director for USDA, Cheryl>????? It's very important, I think, that we push internally at UASDA to make sure that they have some kind of weed science position, that they basically rehire????position and someone for that position, and what that would be titled or called. I mean, we just need to have that weed science presence there internally at USDA, otherwise, we're battling an uphill battle with the other pest management groups continually refilling their position.....We need to keep it in the back of our mind. Jill, I don't know if you had any other thoughts on that, on what we talked about yesterday.
- Jill-I think you covered it very well
- DGS-Who's in the chain of command in making that decision?
- Ultimately it's,
- Really? Now that we have a relationship with him, we can talk to him about it. Actually, I think the issue that we've been hammering him on is a perfect segue. Make the point that if you have key people on you staff that understand the importance of weed science, you probably won't have these problems in the future with us. It's a pretty strong argument
- Hey, Lee, what's Jim....job title?....is that also going to be on that organization stuff that you were sending around soon?
- ?????
- Jim hasn't formally announced the??? yet?
- He's mentioned it, but he hasn't set a date.
- Yeah, we'll all be sensitive to that, thanks.
- All right, one last thing on this.....point, and that's the.....funding. And there is the problem with the.....funding is that people at USDA aren't requesting it for whatever reason, and that's been

going on for 5 years. But then Congress comes back and appropriates the money, and designates it to the....program which includes the regional IPM centers. And for our purpose of though, we will continue to lobby congress at the appropriations committee. In particular, the Senate appropriation, Senator Cole's staff.....In particular, including the money for the regional IPM programs, the RAMP, Risk Avoidance Mitigation Program, there's crops at risk. It's about \$10-15 million worth of funding. And

- ??????
- So there's \$45 million in that section 406 account, about 15 million of that we could track to pest management type activities. And that 4 million, part, that was included in the overall NIFA for the AFRI?? Budget. So we have this number of 426 million, well really they were raiding the 406 funds for 45 million of that and comments that were made from the stakeholders groups was that if you want a ....gain, don't rob Peter to pay Paul with existing research and extension money from other accounts. That message I think was fairly clear at the stakeholders meeting, but to address the situation at hand, and that is USDA did not budget for it but Congress by all accounts, and I'm talking to some of the other lobbyists, they're likely to put that money back in the 406 accounts. But that doesn't mean we can rest on our laurels. We need to continue to send them letters. CropLife America's working on a letter that I'm probably going to ask all the regional weed science and the national weed science societies to sign onto, and that'll be coming up here in the next week, I would guess.
- Lee, this is Donn. From my perspective, at least for the IPM center, what I've seen, almost all of that money ends up going in many case to department chairs or heads of entomology and historically weed science hasn't benefitted. The places I'm familiar with and I've worked at, weed sciences hasn't even been involved in the discussion it just goes to entomology depts., and a lot of places it's just part of their base funding.
- I don't think that quite true
- Well, I'm just talking about where I've been
- Central reason.....
- The interesting think with congress I guess 2 years ago, moved that from effectively, I know it wasn't an earmark, it was almost like formula funds and they moved it to a-what they called a grant, so we actually had to start writing proposals. That was the first time I was actually asked to be at the table. Those dollars historically, I know at the University of Georgia and I'm pretty sure it's the same at Florida, those dollars just went right to the department chairs of Entomology and we never saw it, so it was really interesting when they changed the way it was funded and universities were asked to submit proposals for the dollars, all of a sudden weed science was part of the discussion. So that was actually, that ended up being a good change.
- Other thoughts about section 406 about RAMP. I mean, have any of you applied for grants on ...RAMP?
- Yeah, this is Pam Hutchinson, we've applied for RAMP with like .....or mustard and that type of deal, but we have never been successful.
- I know that Anita.... Was on a review panel, I think it was for RAMP, this spring, whether I believe she said there was only a couple of weed proposals, so really you know only the main program that's applicable to weed science in that whole bit is the regional IPM centers. And that's good to

know b/c there is a couple different draft of letters. One is supporting the whole section 406 funds, the other is just the regional IPM centers.

- I don't think that you can separate the two, though, b/c I've sat on different panels, and the problem is more of a lack of position, b/c there are some very vocal....
- CHANGE TAPE
- I've talked with the corn growers, soybean folks and cotton councils, and they're very, very interested in working with WSSA, even offering them resources to support the interest in developing some of the education materials, co-sponsorship in all the appropriate ways. Mike Owens, of course served on the NRC panel that wrote the report that came out last month. NRC has now expressed very strong support for what WSSA is doing and wants to interact with it. – static- Most recently, Bayer CropScience did support a proposal on what they're calling ?respective rotation? to try to develop a kind of a nationwide campaign to try to discourage inappropriate business management practices. I talked with them just before lunch this morning again. I circulated it to my committee-they've proposed a program approach. I guess the big concern that came back, the main concern, was that there were aspects of it that came across as PR for what they're calling “rotating traits”-static- so there's the discussion about making sure that we promote the right methods in terms of, related to herbicide mode of action, rotation, -static- temperatures??, as well as other cultural-static-. SO that discussion went very well, over all, I though. They certainly understood where we were coming from. I also took a phone call from – static- Association about the idea of –static-. They have been asked to endorse this respective rotation program. They had the same concerns that our committee did, and so I think we're all on the same page that we need to be careful on the advocating for any particular company's technology or stand, whether it's Bayer or anyone else. And so I know ??? taken, with Bayer's permission, the material that they had –static-. I know we have a lot of interest based on the meeting that Jill and I went to in January, from the National Association of Conservation district. They're having a follow-up meeting in July or August in Little Rock. They've expressed a lot of interest in what WSSA, with the right approach, and I think one thing, in addition to a lot of education materials themselves, what the growers' association, NRC and others we've been in discussion with have really liked the idea of wanting to explain the ???support we're gonna be doing ????? Really promote the education program that we've developed and making sure that we're all ?????
- Jill—garbled-
- LVW – Jill, did you want to mention any mode of actions, stuff in any meetings you had there?
- Jill-I haven't finished all of my meetings. I prefer to finish visiting with people and then get my thoughts together before I report that. It's been very wide-ranging. Many groups within EPA are very concerned about the news, and I tried to do as David spile about with the crop groups, trying to explain what the committee is trying to do what the activities at WSSA are and trying to present it as we want to partner with as many as possible and provide assistance to them. And they're very receptive, let me leave it at that. There's a lot of interest from a lot of people.
- LVW-From the national and regional weed science society perspective, we need that unified....and that takes, I've been doing a lot of handholding, talking with all of our stakeholders, but I think we need to act fairly soon on maybe a joint resolution among all the societies, on some of the

mainframe bullet points on resistance management. This is a great opportunity for the societies, and we have been doing this work non-stop it seems at meeting I go to. The science is there, we just need to have a unified message. And I know there are a lot of different opinions on some of the minor aspects on what's best or not. but I think something we should look into as we go into our meeting season this winter is do each of the societies adopt a joint unified message from all of the societies. Does that make sense?

- Jill-and I'd like to echo the semi-urgency so that WSSA and the weed science discipline maintain the message. We need to be active and proactive, because otherwise we risk other groups coming in and trying to-and starting to do something on their own.
- ??-That's almost certain to happen unless we move quickly, so we have to partner with EPA and employ our website and employ our committee, and actually do what they've said and that is have a national discussion
- ??-At the risk of talking about something that I'm nervous about talking-at the Denver meeting there was a group that got together looking forward to the NIFA ??? which hadn't been released yet, and really start talking about some kind of a major collaborative grant in the area of resistance...-terms I'm unfamiliar with????-When the RFA? came out, we couldn't find any place for that group to go. It was a lot of detail, and then we finally found maybe one area, entitled "wide area pest monitoring" that we thought might have some opportunity. It's an extension based program, it's a pretty big program. It's a \$6 million grant, 5 years, unfortunately they'll only fund one grant. So a group of us has been trying to move in that direction. I would say the objective within the constraints of a monitoring program would be to look at what is effective educational programs, use monitoring to look at adoption, use monitoring to look at better resistance, probably establish some ??? screening methods....and there's probably two groups, two areas we're working with, one area that you'd probably call endemic?, so it's pretty widespread, and other states, other areas where the problem is really just starting to emerge into a problem. David and I have been talking and I've proposed a group to work with him on his project number 2, and we're waiting for any feedback on that now. The proposal's due August 11. Honestly, I don't know whether this group is going to pull it off, or not, but it's just basically to make sure that weed science is participating in the NIFA, whether we pull it off, or not, but we should at least try. I just wanted people to know about that. That certainly fits into all this, and could potentially be something useful.
- LVW-Any other thoughts on that? That's very helpful knowing that, that weed science will be trying to take advantage of what Will mentioned there was a weed science in the AFRI priorities. Otherwise, it's completely, well, not that we'd boycott it, but if we don't have any proposals in there, then they could come back and say, "well, we haven't received any proposals, so there must not be a need for weed science."
- ???-It is important to be there, but really, we really didn't have any place where weed sciences normally were. And I do like the thought of getting support from the Cotton Council, wheat growers, soybean growers, to assist us in developing the WSSA website. It could be a major tool for communication
- LVW-One other resistance piece, if you haven't had a chance to get to the WSSA website, on the NRC report that came out April 20 on the ?? of genetically engineered crops, they did call for a call



to action in addressing this issue. Mike Owen has served on that panel. He was the only weed scientist on there, but overall, I think they did a good job. The newspapers got ahold of it, the NYT, and they took egregious statements, which we certainly did not agree with. But there is a statement, a two page letter, on the WSSA website, in response to the NRC report, addressing the pros and cons of not only that report, but of some of the news reports that are out there. Do you have anything else that you want to add to that, John?

- John-Only that we felt that it was important-there was a lot of hyperbole that this position was being used for a lot of things that had nothing to do with resistance management. It was just a tool for disparaging agriculture, really, and we felt that it was really important to get something out on the website that put things in perspective. And we were able to get that to the Wall Street Journal, when they were developing their ??? article.
- LNW-I guess an action item out of the resistance management section is to see if we can get to the point of having a joint resolution among the societies, among the weed science societies on herbicide resistance that has a uniform message that all the societies can adopt at their annual meetings starting in December of this year. Is that too fast?
- ???-No, b/c we want collaboration. We're going to need collaboration among all the regional societies to really move this forward. We're going to need them participating, we're going to need them contributing to the website. The website is going to have to direct things back to the local state extension so that there's somebody to get to if you have a question or need a solution. And so, yeah, I think we need to do that right away.
- ??Jill??-So, Lee, with that, when you mentioned by December, is there a good process that we can help with to start that, so it's not-so it's already coordinated, so we can use this to branch out to our other outside weed science stakeholders, too?
- LVW-Well, I'm not going to give David Shaw anymore work, but I think that's the general consensus, the goal of the Herbicide Resistance Education Committee, the special committee that John started, what, two months ago? And so it's putting a huge burden on them, but I think that has pretty good regional representation, if I'm not mistaken.
- John-Yes, it does. I'm not sure that that's the charge of our committee. I think I may be missing the point. Tell me why that would be falling on our committee, as opposed to the Science Policy Committee.
- LVW-I think it certainly falls under the Science Policy Committee, especially with my position, in relation to the regional science societies, so I guess I'm looking for material, for the message. And certainly I can coordinate that
- DGS-John, let me ask you a question. If the question is how does the profession of weed science develop a consolidated position on resistance management that is bought into by all the societies, then I guess, I would assume that the Herbicide Resistance Committee would be the one that coordinates that game plan, shouldn't it?
- John-You mean the Herbicide Tolerant Plant Committee?
- DGS-I thought we had a Herbicide Resistance Committee.
- ???-We do. That's the one that Bill Vencill chairs.
- John-Right, and that would be a good place for this to come from. There's a lot of expertise that lives there. When we put out that two page document out on the website, we actually had that

reviewed by that entire committee, and then reviewed by the entire board. It's not so difficult to have things broadly reviewed and get input, so I think that what we would want to do, and Bill's very busy, too, I think that what we would want to do is start out is a structured framework of where we think that this could go, and we would ask that committee to fill it in. We would ask *this* committee to sponsor it, and perhaps the Resistance Education Committee to help with the review.

- DGS-Just so I understand-when we talk about a consolidated game plan, we need some sort of game plan that has multiple elements in it. Is that what we're talking about? Somewhere we need a document that says, "Here's our game plan for promoting better resistance management; all the societies buy into it." And then there'll be many elements to it. There may be educational elements, there may be letter writing elements. Is that what you're talking about? There must be a large game plan, and then a bunch of different elements. Is that true?
- John-yes, and actually, Dave put together a subcommittee to help the education committee focus on pretty much exactly that.
- DGS-so is the WSSA Herbicide Resistance Committee developing a broad game plan, and many of the elements could be distributed out to other groups or individuals for implementation?
- John-Not yet.
- DGS-Ok, but that committee is kind of charged, tasked with developing a plan that would be forwarded to the WSSA board....ok, that's what I thought. I just wanted to make sure I understood.
- ???-Maybe let me clarify my comments just a little bit. We're looking at that-that's on my committee's plate. I guess what I thought I had heard, though, was for kind of a joint resolution that would call for a unified approach to education, and based on sound science...-static-
- DGS-Let's just say the Resistance Committee creates a game plan with multiple elements, one of which may be tasking your subcommittee with developing recommendations in education, and there may be other elements in the action plan as well, that other individuals would be responsible for.
- John?-We're just beginning to gel this right now, in light of this conversation. I think it would be difficult to all of a sudden create this big creature. We need to give this a little thought.
- DGS-Yes, that's why I'm bringing this up. A statement that we all buy into, a kind of an overarching statement, a belief, a philosophy of how we should respond to weed management, that may be just one element of this overall game plan.
- ???-and I just want to say that of course, the Public Awareness Committee could be part of one of the streams in the broader strategy, we'd be happy to help. We just want to make sure we look at, and I haven't seen it recently, is the module for resistance management in the pest web ??? it's being worked on now. I have not seen a draft of it, but I know people are working on that. If anyone on the call knows about it, they can give us an update. Otherwise, I'll check and let you know where that was, b/c that was funded for this year to be done, to be put in the Pest education web tool.
- Tom Holt-I may have missed it, if somebody mentioned it, but I just wanted to make sure. It's been mentioned that we'd like to have one voice. Obviously, the Southern has a Weed Resistance committee, I'm assuming that all the societies have weed resistance committees. Why wouldn't those committee chairs put together and come up with one unified ???

- ???-I'm not sure the way the composition works, but from what I understand, I think that Bill Vencill ???
- Hillary- I'd have to check with ??? but the NE actual had a special resolution a couple of years ago before I got on the board to have a policy ????
- John-Herbicide Resistant Plant committee, it does have regional representation. They may not be the chairs of the Herbicide Resistance committees of the regionals, but they certainly have access to them and can coordinate with them and be a conduit back. And Hillary, we'd love to do that.
- LVW-I'm going to follow up on Tom's comment on the regional representation on resistance. We'll draw up a resolution and something we can shoot for in these coming meetings. All right, on the third thing, the MPDF permit for release, the draft, the language was really ??? You've probably seen the letter ?? or saw the email. John, if you want to go over what the process is over the next 35 days or so.
- John-This published in the federal register last Friday, so it's 45 days from last Friday, which is July 19. We're working hard to assess what's going on in this new permit program. We've actually brought in outside help to help us here, and draft comments. I'll be going to CropLife and sitting down with ?? and the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Foundation and their Aquatic committee, and we'll be going over the components of a response. And I would hope to very shortly after that have a set of talking points and a draft WSSA response to the MPDS program that we can submit to the docket. I think it would be great if that included all of the regional societies and we're working towards that. And so that's next Monday, and so this is going to go really fast.
- Hillary-John, have you been part of many discussions on the complexity of services, not having ???
- LVW-These listening sessions are coming up, and I'd encourage all of you to at least register for the ??? on June 17, and there's ??? on the MPDS document of the WSSA website. Thank you again, John, for helping bulldog this. And if by chance you can make it to one of the regional public comment meetings, Albuquerque, NM June 13, Boise, ID June 16, Boston June 21, Washington DC June 23, I'd encourage you to do that. And if you know people in that area, I'd ask you to share that information with them.
- John-And in fact, the regional presidents, it would be really useful if you wanted to, 8f you took the note that I sent out yesterday and then sent that through your distribution, and in your cover to my letter, you could say "Inside here, there's information on these regional meetings, and it's very important that we have representation at those regional meetings." And encourage the regional individuals, b/c as we're represented there, that's the voice that we have. We don't have too much more than that. So we have to make use of that opportunity.
- LVW\_There's a couple other thoughts on the permits. Overall, they end up being very specific on the things that it would cover, and while that's good, for aquatic weeds and aquatic pests, forest canopies, whatnot, there's still this huge unknown about what would be covered if you accidentally or unintentionally applied pesticide spraying your corn field, and you sprayed over a waterway and it had temporary water in it. Could you be liable? You wouldn't be covered under this permit as it's written
- John-the agency's been pretty explicit about that. What's not covered is still in. you don't get a pass on the clean water act just because you're not included in the permit. What you do is you get sued. And because you have all these records that are available, and there will be individuals

looking at those records very carefully. And this particular set of permits is only the first step. The next one comes in and pulls in spray drift, and then there's a lot of things that will happen.

- LVW-So, our position as the national/regional weed science society is that we do not approve of the permits or the court's decision or anything. If we can make all of this go away, by going back to ??? as the regulatory law that we follow, and support with our science, that's our position,. There are certainly efforts on the Hill, and that'll hinge on Capitol Hill basically voiding, or Congress clarifying the law, and what's covered under ??? or the Clean Water Act, and/or providing an exemption from that. And if that legislation – well, it would be a rider on some Bill, and we're not going to hear about it if it does happen. But ??? is out there, and it's probably going to take some blood in their elections in November for that to happen. There is effort going on above and beyond my job description, and I hope that happens. Ok, with that, just a couple of last quick notes on spray drift. We got over 200,000 comments. There was a meeting with EPA administrator Jackson and Secretary ??? when he was here. Right now, my understanding is that – CHANGE TAPE- WSSA meetings in Portland next February. So, that's something to be thinking about in the next few months.
- ???-unintelligible???
- LVW-Yes, we will have-well the first's here in Albuquerque next Monday. And if you – well, the two-page letter on the WSSA website's a good starting point. We might have some more specifics on what's good and bad on the permits, but the general idea is that this permit's not going to provide any more safer or cleaner water supply. The ??? is not broken, and the permits are just going to added ? mandate to the states, and a liability to our pesticide applicators.
- John-yeah, I would direct you to that two-page letter on our website, because it does cover some ground and gives some basic information. The permit is an unfunded mandate, it only increases paperwork, it doesn't increase safety, and it's really only for trial lawyers. That's really who benefits from this. So we'll try as hard as we can to get you j=guys something as quick as we can.
- ???-unintelligible???
- John-And we'll push that all the way down through the society as far down as we can go. I'm sure the regionals-we're really going to try and get that done. We've got day jobs too.
- LVW\_Alright, thanks everyone for sticking around for an hour and a half.