2016 AAPCO Spring Meeting
Committee, Liaison, and Workgroup Reports
AAPCO Workgroup or Liaison Report to Annual Meeting

Work Group/Liaison Name: **Laboratory Committee**  
Lead Person’s Name: **Michelle Bogner**  
Date of Report: **February 10, 2016**

**Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session:**  
These are the issues the working group or liaison wishes to raise for specific deliberation by the AAPCO Board of Directors and/or the AAPCO General Session at the annual meeting. (*Note: This section can also include a self-assessment as to the effectiveness and continued need for this workgroup/liaison function.*)

The Laboratory Committee has no issues to be raised at this time.

**General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:**  
This summary will be included in the General Session meeting folder (*Note: Reports that contain specific recommendations will be acted upon individually.*)

The Laboratory Committee meets annually during the AAPCO spring meeting. The following report outlines activities from last year’s meeting.

The Laboratory Committee met on Monday, March 9 and Tuesday, March 10, 2015 at the Hilton Alexandria Old Town during the AAPCO annual meeting in Alexandria, VA. There were a total of 10 participants, a large decrease from the previous year. Of those participants, 5 were from state laboratories, three were from EPA and two were from industry. The low attendance was mostly due to many state lab directors attending a FDA ISO meeting in California being held during the same week. Also held during this week was PittCon, which may have attributed some to the low attendance.

Ping Wan of the Indiana State Chemist’s Office provided an update on the AAPCO Formulation Check Sample Program. In the previous check sample round, 79 laboratories participated, similar to the prior year. Once again, there were more international labs that participated than domestic labs. Products that are able to be used for this program are restricted by shipping constrictions, especially for international shipping. For example, aerosols cannot be shipped and organophosphates are restricted in amounts that can be shipped. There are usually three products representing four active ingredients that are used. Participants can choose to do however many of the four they wish. This year the deltamethrin product that was a dust was problematic for many of the labs. Some labs do not participate every year, but alternate years.
An update on the Wisconsin Residue Check Sample Program was given by Steve Sobeck of Wisconsin’s Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection. There are 37 labs in the program, only 28-32 are active in any given year. Two rounds of samples were sent out in the last year, one set of soil in the spring and another set of foliage in the fall. A new foliage of corn leaves was used this year at the request of participants for a foliage that was not so dry. A couple labs reported issues with homogeneity of the foliage samples. Because of this and information shared with Wisconsin, Steve will be doing a survey of participants to see if the amounts sent out are still appropriate and to ask about adding some new compounds to the list of possible analytes spiked. Wisconsin checks similarity of spikes from jar to jar, which is called “homogeneity testing” in the report. They also test for stability of compounds spiked over several weeks after shipments. Wisconsin is compliant with the ISO 17043 standard and are now on the list of acceptable PT providers published by The American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA).

Terry Cole from EPA’s repository gave an update on difficulties the repository is facing. Staffing has been cut for the repository making it more challenging to keep up with orders, especially during the summer when many states have their busy seasons for drift and other complaints. They have fallen behind in putting out regular newsletters that are distributed via AgLabs. These newsletters contain information on standards that have expiration dates coming up in the near future, standards that are currently on backorder and standards recently received. The committee encouraged them to at least put out regular letters with the backlog list since many labs will order from another source if they know the analyte is on backlog. This could save the repository staff time by not having to respond to requests for backlogged analytes. The repository prefers orders on-line; they will eventually stop accepting orders by fax. They encourage labs to not throw away expired standards, but to check with the repository for new Certificates of Analysis for them by requesting the new certificates on an order form with the expired analyte and its lot number.

Paul Golden reported on EPA’s lab. They lost five people this year and are hoping to hire at least one replacement. The Mississippi lab has closed and only one person transferred to the lab at Fort Meade.

Eric Petty presented work being done in Colorado in the testing of hemp for cannabidiol, cannabinol and delta-9 THC levels to assure that it is industrial hemp and not marijuana. The presentation included information on Colorado standards, what industrial hemp is used for and extraction and analysis methodology for the testing.
Jim Stry of Dupont talked about the new requirements for registrants to determine extraction efficiencies of the methods tested and reported on as part of their registration package. They do this by comparing data gained during the metabolism study using radioactive labeled product with the quantities found using the various residue methods. Overall they find that the QuEChERS method used internationally is about 70% efficient for watery crops and 50% efficient for dry crops.

A report on the 2014 SFIREG meetings was presented by Michelle Bogner of Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. Topics discussed were the methomyl labeling requirements, EPA performance measures and the need for labs to be able to give SLAs the needed information for the labs, an update on the pollinator project, the EPA study on cleaning up compounds used indoors, highlights for region reports, cover crops, DfE labeling, the beginning of Enlist Duo use and information on the new EPA website for analytical methods for pesticide testing.

Michael Hastings of Dow provided an update on their work on methods for testing of residues in compost. Working toward improving recoveries for method. May use standard addition to correct for matrix effects that are very sample specific, or use isotopic internal standards to correct for recoveries. They are also considering a derivatization step.

Several states in attendance gave brief updates on current issues in their state lab including testing of pollinator friendly plants for presence of neonicotinoids, hemp testing, new equipment, accreditation efforts, extensive pesticide screens via LC/MS/MS, and document control software being used.

Michelle Yaras explained the use of EPA funding for national laboratory workshops ($30,000 per year). A workshop is be co-hosted in 2015 by Indiana and Oklahoma. States were encouraged to consider hosting. It was decided that it would be a good strategy to apply for grant money the fiscal year prior to holding the workshop in order to have money in hand for spring meetings as EPA often does not get funds to release until too late in the spring to allow for same year planning. Minnesota will apply for fiscal year 2016 money to host a workshop in 2017. Other states were encouraged to consider hosting in future years. Every other year there may be an additional $41,700 available for workshops. It was confirmed through Michelle Yaras that we could utilize vendor training for these workshops with a state handling reimbursement and payment for the courses as their “hosting” obligations. Years when there is extra money would work well for this strategy. Since the meeting Michelle Yaras has corrected this understanding that in the years where there is additional $41,700 funding,
that would be used instead of the $30,000, not in addition to so that the $30,000 could be used for training needed in the tribes.

The Laboratory Committee is meeting during the 2016 AAPCO meeting on Monday, March 7 and Tuesday, March 8. Agenda topics include topic discussions on ISO17025 accreditation, QAPP revisions, global harmonization system, a presentation on the use of high-resolution instruments in pesticide residue analysis, a presentation on gaining efficiencies in times of budget cuts, state updates, and updates from the check sample programs, EPA repository, grant funding and SFIREG.

Respectfully submitted,
Michelle Bogner, Michigan
Website Report

Amy Bamber, AAPCO-SFIREG Executive Secretary
Business Meeting
March 8, 2016

The new website was developed in a WordPress.com environment, and went live September 8, 2015. The website costs $299 a year to maintain. Since first being published the site has had 2,019 visitors and 9,106 views.

Website Visits per Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the fall of 2015, daily views were between 6-10 visits per day. In Jan and Feb 2016, daily views were 30 or more a day.

Most Viewed Pages

Here is a breakdown of the various pages and the number of views, i.e. what is most popular and/or useful to our audience:

- Home page / Archives: 2,472
- AAPCO: 1,789
- Control Officials: 1,245
- SFIREG: 481
- Working Committees: 227
- Current Topics: 213
- Calendar of Events: 181
- AAPCO Officers and Directors: 120
- Full SFIREG Committee Members: 107
- Partner Resources: 89

Referrers

How are people finding us, outside of directly going to aapco.org?

- search engines: 1,300
- epa.gov: 596
aapse.ext.vt.edu 18
tsgusa.com 12
hc-sc.gc.ca 10
facebook 9
npmapestworld.org 7
aapfco.org 7
aspcro.org 7
nasda.org 5

**Link Clicks**

These are the links that are clicked most often:

eventbrite.com 359
hilton.com 166
hilton.com 21
www.regulations.gov 21
federalregister.gov (NPDES) 18
texasagriculture.gov 16
aapse.ext.vt.edu 15
listserv.foodshield.org (AGLABS) 12

**Geography of Views**

8,540 United States
125 Canada
78 Spain
56 Brazil
39 Malaysia
28 India
24 Romania
18 Russia
16 Belgium
12 Switzerland
I will provide a presentation of the website, answer questions, and accept feedback during the 2016 Business Meeting.

Goals for the website in the upcoming year include continued reformatting and uploading of previous meeting minutes, documents, life members and past presidents. I expect this will occur primarily during the summer months.

I may streamline the Current Topics page as topics continue to expand.

I will encourage laboratories to provide material for the Laboratory Resources section of Partner Resources. I will also encourage states or others to provide educational outreach materials for inclusion on the website in the Partner Resources section.

Respectfully Submitted,
AAPCO Workgroup or Liaison Report to Annual Meeting

Work Group/Liaison Name: CTAG Board

Lead Person’s Name: Gary Fish, ME

Date of Report: February 11, 2016

**Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session:**

These are the issues the working group or liaison wishes to raise for specific deliberation by the AAPCO Board of Directors and/or the AAPCO General Session at the annual meeting. *(Note: This section can also include a self-assessment as to the effectiveness and continued need for this workgroup/liaison function.)*

The Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG) is seeking nominations to fill six CTAG Board of Directors positions whose terms are expiring. Two cooperative extension service (CES) representatives and 4 state lead agency (SLA) representatives are needed. The new board members will begin their terms on April 1, 2016 and serve through March 31, 2019. The Board will make the selection by the end of March 2016. It is expected that the elected members will be able to attend two board meetings per year, with expenses covered by an EPA cooperative agreement if needed.

If you are interested in helping to work on and guide CTAG activities, and would like to be considered as a candidate for a position on the CTAG Board of Directors, please send me an email **no later than February 19th** at jpeterson@azda.gov. We recognize that this is a busy time of year for many people. If you cannot provide the information below by **February 19th**, please send a note expressing your interest and providing an estimate of when you can respond completely.

Candidates are requested to provide:
1) a brief description of their pesticide program experience
2) why they wish to be considered for this position
3) issues in the certification program that they want to address and why they are of interest to the candidate

Even if you previously applied and were not selected, you are encouraged to apply again. Each board make up is unique, so each year we encourage anyone with interest to apply. All nominations received will be reviewed and voted on by the CTAG Board of Directors. The current board has members who were turned down previously, so do not be discouraged...apply.

CTAG was formed in 1997 to undertake an in-depth review of the national pesticide certification and training program. In 2001, CTAG established a Board of Directors to facilitate and guide this process. Members on this Board are with the Environmental
Protection Agency (EPA), State Lead Agencies, and Cooperative Extension Services and liaison with the American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE), the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials, (AAPCO), the Association of Structural Pesticide Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO), the Tribal Pesticide Program Council (TPPC), The Board is directed by two Co-Chairs and most Board members serve overlapping three year terms. Kevin Keaney with the EPA Office of Pesticide Programs and myself are the current co-chairs.

Since its inception, CTAG has worked closely with its partners to facilitate change and improvement in this program. We are pleased with our accomplishments to date and look forward to continuing efforts to promote the safe and effective use of pesticides through education, training and testing. Please take a look at our website for additional information on CTAG and its activities http://ctaginfo.org.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration!

**General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:**
This summary will be included in the General Session meeting folder

**Status of CTAG Work Assignments**

August 14, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Member(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Process and Tracking Documents</td>
<td>Michelle, Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Tracking &amp; Work Assignment Documents; add new issues; circulate to Board for review and approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post meeting summaries and Tracking Document on CTAG web site.</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status of Implementation of &quot;21st Century&quot; Goals</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the status of activities toward implementation of the “21st Century” goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liaisons &amp; Meeting Summary</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select replacement SFIREG/AAPCO liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send meeting summary to AAPSE, AAPCO, ASPCRO, and EPA Regions</td>
<td>Gary, Linda, Katy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Internal &amp; External Marketing</td>
<td>Betsy, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update new employees resources website, publicize to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicit feedback from stakeholders on what other materials are necessary for C&amp;T programs (e.g., category manuals, etc.)</td>
<td>Carol, Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Member(s)</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively market availability of national exam item banks and manuals</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Update Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update charter and circulate for Board approval</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post updated charter on website</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Labeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review existing resources that could help educators and regulators share information about labeling</td>
<td>Betsy, Kim, Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop PowerPoint and/or paper on how labeling has changed generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft article for JPSE based on PowerPoint/paper on labeling changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Certification Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on hold until proposed changes to certification rule are published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review existing certification standards; compare certification standards for federal categories and state certification standards</td>
<td>Marjorie, Laurie, Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stories in Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine paper to focus on how to use stories in training and recommend what should accompany submissions of stories for use in training</td>
<td>Kim, Thia Betsy, Laurie, Marty, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pollinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Managed Pollinator Protection Plan guidance is released, develop standard BMPs related to pollinator protection that can be shared with states, added to category manuals, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Limited Use Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate Board’s comments and post to website</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CTAG Accomplishment Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft accomplishment report</td>
<td>Jack, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Collaboration Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check on document status; update if necessary and send around to the Board; post on website if final</td>
<td>Katy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Resources for New Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review website</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Member(s)</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Program Impacts/Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine paper based on Board’s suggestions, distribute for comments</td>
<td>Carol, Gary, Laurie, Katy</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON HOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide comments on the paper</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON HOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish paper, solicit participants in pilot mentoring program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ON HOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update website as necessary</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Fracking &amp; Applicator Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue dialogue with AAPCO/SFIREG on fracking issue</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Webinars for Recertification Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop paper focusing on training programs delivered asynchronously, including proctoring and self-verification controls</td>
<td>Laurie, Thia, Carol, Marjorie, Marty, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Listserves: AAPCO (SLACERT), AAPSE, ASPCRO, PSEP, TPPC
**2016 AAPCO Liaison Report to Annual Meeting**

**Work Group/Liaison Name:** NASDA Liaison Report

**Person’s Name:** Chuck Moses, NV

**Date of Report:** March 8, 2016

**Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session:**

None.

**General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:**

NASDA has participated in the AAPCO Pollinator, Worker Protection Standards (WPS) and Certification Workgroups during the past year. AAPCO members received invites to participate in Pollinator and Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS) webinars. In addition to this, AAPCO members were invited to attend and participate in the upcoming MP3 Symposium (scheduled for later this week). Informational requests made by NASDA were responded to promptly by AAPCO and SFIREG members.
AAPCO Workgroup/Liaison Report to 2016 Annual Meeting

**Work Group/Liaison Name:** Pesticide Programs Dialogue Committee (PPDC)

**Lead Person’s Name:** John Peckham, Minnesota Department of Agriculture

**Members:** Various Stakeholders

**Date of Report:** February 16, 2016

**Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session:**

**Background**

The PPDC is a diverse group of stakeholders and their representatives from user/grower/farmer, environmental/public interest/animal welfare, farmworker, public health, chemical/biopesticide industry, state/local/tribal government and federal agencies.

The size of the group and the diverse orientation of the stakeholders and their representatives makes for challenges by EPA in organizing and keeping topics on track and challenges by members seeking to be heard.

In addition to stakeholders and their representatives, members of the general public including state SLA’s are also in attendance who may be engaged by EPA and or the stakeholders and their representatives to provide opinions/information on various subjects included on the formal agenda.

At times the dialogue is dominated by a few individuals with very strong opinions/positions that they feel they must take to represent their entity and or stakeholders. The domination of the conversation by a few leaves very little opportunity for others to express their opinions.

EPA would be well served in establishing meeting rules to allow the maximum number of people to have involvement. EPA should also consider limiting opportunities for stakeholders to comment who either have not been at previous meetings or who have not provided work inputs to EPA.

The AAPCO liaison has routinely shared PPDC documents including meeting agendas and has sought input/direction from the board as deemed important to activities of AAPCO.
AAPCO should consider the benefit that it receives as a member of PPDC vs. the enhanced impact that it may have with other EPA venues discussing the same topics such as SFIREG POM/EQI.

**General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:**

*Participation on the Incident Data Workgroup – October 20, 2015; Conference Calls December 9, 2015, February 18, 2016*

As the AAPCO liaison, this is the area where I have spent the majority of my time.

The role of the incident data workgroup is to establish the collection of data that will allow EPA and stakeholders to determine types and trends in incidents and regulatory issues that may need to be addressed.

At the October 20, 2015 meeting, fourteen (14) members of the work group and nine (9) others were in attendance.

For the December 9, 2015 and February 18, 2016 conference calls both incident data workgroup members and non-members participated.

The Incident Data Work group time has been spent primarily by the work group reviewing and ranking incident data.

Review of human health data is almost complete. Much of the information included is information that SLA’s already collect as part of SLA complaint intake/investigation process. The information that identifies complainants may be considered confidential and/or subject to state and federal data practices and possibly HIPPA which would preclude medical providers from submitting such information. The collection of information not already tracked by SLA’s may be a future issue if reporting of such information becomes the norm.

Next step for review is environmental data.

*Participation at the PPDC Meeting - October 21 & 22, 2015*

Updates included:

- Revisions to the Applicator Certification Rule were presented. Several concerns were raised about the cost and timing of implementation if the rule as adopted without revision.

- Revisions to the WPS rule were presented. Concerns were raised about the production and distribution of EPA approved training materials in time for the enforcement deadlines.

- Report on the IPM Workgroup. It was suggested that EPA continue to support School IPM programs.
- Report from the Pollinator Protection Workgroup. Pollinators can be protected through label modifications, pollinator protection plans, info/outreach by SLA’s and involvement by SLA’s in bee kill investigations. The workgroup should continue.

- Report on the ESA activities of EPA and FWS. Biological evaluations underway for three pilot actives; chlorpyrifos, diazinon and malathion.

- Report on the Comparative Label Statements Program. Comment made that SLA’s may have difficulty with label statements that seem to infer “safety” vs. FIFRA claims that are allowed.

There were also cutting science presentations on the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, Human Health Risk Assessment Approach to Organophosphates, Public Health Workgroup and the 21st Century/New Integrated Testing Strategies Workgroup. All are long term programs that continue to look at potential effects to humans from pesticides and how best to capture useful information.

NOTE: Information is available for PPDC activities on the EPA’s website:

http://www.epa.gov/pesticide-advisory-committees-and-regulatory-partners/pesticide-program-dialogue-committee-ppdc#workgroups
AAPCO Workgroup or Liaison Report to Annual Meeting

Work Group/Liaison Name: AAPCO WPS Workgroup

Lead Person’s Name: Patrick Jones, NC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Booker</td>
<td>Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.booker@tn.gov">kathy.booker@tn.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaci Buhl</td>
<td>Oregon State University - NPIC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buhlk@ace.orst.edu">buhlk@ace.orst.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Burnette Jr.</td>
<td>North Carolina Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.burnette@ncagr.gov">james.burnette@ncagr.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Castro-Escobar</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Agriculture &amp; Rural Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:escobara@michigan.gov">escobara@michigan.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Cervantes</td>
<td>Texas Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Perry.Cervantes@texasagriculture.gov">Perry.Cervantes@texasagriculture.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Cobb</td>
<td>MS Dept. of Ag &amp; Commerce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jasper@mdac.ms.gov">Jasper@mdac.ms.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Dierker</td>
<td>Texas Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Juliana.Dierker@texasagriculture.gov">Juliana.Dierker@texasagriculture.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Friend</td>
<td>Florida Dept. of Agricultural &amp; Consumer Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kelly.friend@freshfromflorida.com">kelly.friend@freshfromflorida.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Galloway</td>
<td>USEPA Region 7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Galloway.Carol@epa.gov">Galloway.Carol@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Hoskins</td>
<td>NASDA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dudley@nasda.org">Dudley@nasda.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Jones</td>
<td>North Carolina Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patrick.jones@ncagr.gov">patrick.jones@ncagr.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Kohler</td>
<td>MS Dept. of Ag &amp; Commerce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:russellk@mdac.ms.gov">russellk@mdac.ms.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ledlow</td>
<td>MS Dept. of Ag &amp; Commerce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michaelL1@mdac.ms.gov">michaelL1@mdac.ms.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Marciano</td>
<td>California Department of Pesticide Regulation Enforcement Branch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Donna.Marciano@cdpr.ca.gov">Donna.Marciano@cdpr.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Peterson</td>
<td>Arizona Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpeterson@azda.gov">jpeterson@azda.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Pont</td>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pont.Richard@epamail.epa.gov">Pont.Richard@epamail.epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Rivera</td>
<td>Texas Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randy.rivera@texasagriculture.gov">randy.rivera@texasagriculture.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Ross</td>
<td>California Department of Pesticide Regulation Enforcement Branch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lisa.Ross@cdpr.ca.gov">Lisa.Ross@cdpr.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Scott</td>
<td>Office of the Indiana State Chemist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scottde@purdue.edu">scottde@purdue.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Strickland</td>
<td>Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.strickland@tn.gov">richard.strickland@tn.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Voller</td>
<td>MS Dept. of Ag &amp; Commerce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LauraV@mdac.ms.gov">LauraV@mdac.ms.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau Whisenant</td>
<td>Texas Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Beau.Whisenant@texasagriculture.gov">Beau.Whisenant@texasagriculture.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Fitz</td>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Fitz.Nancy@epa.gov">Fitz.Nancy@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Reed</td>
<td>Office of the Indiana State Chemist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reedleio@purdue.edu">reedleio@purdue.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of Report: 2/25/2016

Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session: These are the issues the working group or liaison wishes to raise for specific deliberation by the AAPCO Board of Directors and/or the AAPCO General Session at the annual meeting. (Note: This section can also include a self-assessment as to the effectiveness and continued need for this workgroup/liaison function.)
None noted.

General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:
This summary will be included in the General Session meeting folder
(Note: Reports that contain specific recommendations will be acted upon individually.)

The work group has completed two conference calls since the first of the year. I was asked to be the WPS Work Group chair in December of 2015, after the WPS Prep that was held in California.

Discussions have focused primarily on enforcement concerns of the application exclusion zone (AEZ), and self-employed handlers. We have also discussed WPS inspection requirements related to the amount of documentation for compliant inspections.

The biggest concern with the AEZ is its extension beyond the agricultural establishment, dependent on the droplet size produced by application equipment. The rule states, “The AEZ must be free of all persons other than appropriately trained and equipped handlers during pesticide applications”.

Richard Pont explained EPA’s interpretation of the AEZ as follows: The grower must suspend the application and assess the situation of the spray application. If he determines that the application can continue without contacting any person – AND keep the spray material on his property, then the application can continue. He explained that OGC was in agreement with this interpretation.

Richard Pont stated that EPA was not interested in opening up the rule again, but ensured us the EPA did not intend to prevent applicators from being able to apply pesticides if they could assure no contact with people. In February, Nancy Fitz reported that they are pushing the AEZ Interpretative Guidance thru the EPA process. She is hopeful that it will be out by the end of February, they will then share it with the AAPCO WPS Work Group. The work group will review the guidance and ensure no pertinent points are missing. In short the guidance keys in on suspending the application until the applicator can ensure that he will keep the pesticide materials on the agricultural establishment and not allow contact with other people.

We have also discussed the definition of a handler and the inclusion of “Self Employed Handler”. Richard Pont explained that the agricultural owner could serve as many roles within WPS, including a handler or worker, depending on the tasks they were performing. There is some concern about the “AEZ” and other requirements being “in” now where before we only told
owners and immediate family that they only had to comply with label
statements (No contact with other persons, PPE and REI’s). Now with the
new revisions the owner/immediate family members are covered by WPS
requirements for handlers including the AEZ, respirator fit testing, medical
evaluations, etc. These issues will be addressed in a publication for
immediate family and owners.

Documentation requirements for compliant inspections was also discussed in
February. Leo Reed stated that the narrative reports for compliant
inspections seems to be over burdensome and redundant. Most members
are fine with the report writing for cases with violations. But it does seem a
bit over kill for inspections where all is compliant with WPS. We also
discussed, with the expansion of electronic reporting and data collection
from field inspection forms (very detailed inspection forms), there is less of a
need and very difficult to capture narrative text. Most of the narratives are
just re-stating the facts of the Inspection form – there is no less detailed of
a report without the narrative.

We discussed the benefits of increasing the number of inspections and
showing more of a field presence instead of increasing the inspection and
reporting time for field staff to complete a narrative and other
documentation including photos, labels, etc. We believe the field presence
and increasing the visibility of an inspection force would be a greater benefit
for true worker protections than completing the narratives and following all
of the detailed inspection/reporting requirements. Richard Pont said that
here may be a place for WPS Inspections that confirm compliance with the
major WPS Points.

The AAPCO Work Group will also be involved with reviewing the WPS
Inspection Guidance document. In February, Carol Galloway reported that a
draft WPS Inspection Guidance should be out by the end of March or the first
of April. The AAPCO work group may have a chance to review the draft
guidance prior to being released to the States. States will also be asked to
submit questions for more clarification on WPS issues that have arisen
during early outreach and compliance efforts.

Conference calls are normally scheduled for the first Friday of each month
and will continue as needed.
AAPCO Workgroup or Liaison Report to Annual Meeting

Work Group/Liaison Name: AAPCO C&T Workgroup

Lead Person’s Name: Tim Creger, NE

Date of Report: February 10, 2016

Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session:

There is one issue to be raised to the General Session regarding the Work Group’s proposed equivalency approach, which is presented in further detail below.

General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:

The AAPCO C&T Rule Work Group was assembled in early September, 2015, and meet on average once a week through the middle of January. The Work Group conducted a detailed analysis of the EPA proposed rule change for the national Certification and Training Program, and welcomed the assistance of Texas A&M University Extension who provided an assessment of the Rule’s Economic Assessment. The final work product of the Work Group was a lengthy written comment document submitted on behalf of AAPCO to the EPA Federal docket. In addition to the regular conference calls, the Work Group met once in person with EPA Office of Pesticide Programs on November 18th and again by conference call on January 11th.

The key points the comment document made included the state’s concerns about EPA’s apparent underestimation of the economic impact of the proposed rule to state lead agencies and the pesticide industry, the significant amount of legislative and regulation changes the rule would impose on states, the lack of credible supporting evidence that presents a convincing argument for the need of such a large-scale change, and the very real aspect of states being left no choice but to revert their certification programs back to the federal agency.

One very important aspect of the collaborative work between Work Group and EPA for states to know about is the possible inclusion of an equivalency approach in the final rule. EPA approached the AAPCO Work Group with this idea after our first face-to-face meeting, and the Work Group presented EPA with a number of suggestions on how an equivalency approach might work. This is very important for all state lead agencies to know about and understand, since it is very possible the final rule will include something similar to what the Work Group presented to EPA, but it was not mentioned in any great detail in the proposed rule. If anyone wants to see what the Work Group submitted to
EPA for the equivalency approach, I would suggest they find the AAPCO comments submitted to the docket on the Regulations.gov website.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Creger, Chair
AAPCO LIFE MEMBERSHIP/MEMORIALS COMMITTEE
2016
RECOMMENDATIONS
Respectfully submitted by
Life Membership and Memorials Committee
Jim Burnette, Jr., Chair (and still as far as I know, the sole Committee Member!)
February 25, 2016

LIFE MEMBERSHIP NOMINATION:

Jim Gray
Southwest District Director, NDSU Extension Service;
Formerly, Pesticide and Fertilizer Division Director,
ND Department of Agriculture

Nominated by Cary Giguere, Agrichemical Program Manager, Vermont Agency of Agriculture,
Agricultural Resource Management & Environmental Stewardship:

I would like to nominate Jim Gray as a life time member of AAPCO. Jim has transformed the way states engage with our co-regulators at EPA. Jim’s relationship building skills have allowed him to pioneer the Regulator in Residence program and build bridges that have defined a new model of how AAPCO and SFIREG interact with EPA. Jim’s efforts to improve the regulatory landscape have left their mark both locally in North Dakota and Nationally. Jim has tirelessly worked for consensus on tough FIFRA issues and has done a remarkable job in SFIREG leadership positions. Jim provided incredibly enthusiastic engagement in every project he worked on. It has been an honor working with Jim and I would hope the Board will consider him for Lifetime membership to AAPCO.

Thank you.
A.L. ‘Punk’ Bonner, Jr.
December 10, 1935 - June 2, 2015
(Oklahoma)

A.L. ‘Punk’ Bonner, Jr. was born to Ruby & Arthur Bonner in Indiahoma, Oklahoma on December 10, 1935. After graduating from Lawton High School and being a member of the Corp at Texas A & M, he transferred to Oklahoma A & M and graduated with a degree in Animal Husbandry. During his stay at Oklahoma A & M he was a member or ROTC, Block & Bridle, and a lifelong brother to the members of Alpha Gamma Rho.

Punk married Katy Kay Keathley on December 28, 1957 and they returned to Lawton and raised three children: Katy Beth, Bob and Becky.

Lawton recognized Punk's civic contribution as a member of Jaycee’s Junior Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis, Rotary Club, 4-H Club and Wichita Mt. Sunrise Service, by awarding him 1961 Outstanding Young Man of Lawton. Punk contributed to the youth of Lawton by being President of the School Board as well as Little League Coach and taking the First United Methodist Youth Group on “Mystery Trips”. Punk also served his country in the Oklahoma National Guard for 14 years being honorably discharged at the rank of Captain. He was a Master Mason in Lawton Triangle Lodge 548; 32nd degree Mason in Guthrie, OK; York Rite in Lawton, OK; Shriner in India Shrine Temple; and a member of the Old Wheels Unit.

In Lawton, Punk was a plant manager for Katy-K Meat Packers. When he moved his family to Garber, Punk joined the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, retiring as the
Director of the Plant Industry in 1998. Governor Frank Keating awarded him for his work for the state by proclaiming July 1, 1998 as A.L. “Punk” Bonner Day. Punk served as AAPCO President during 1995 – 1996; and was awarded Life Membership status in 1998.

Katy Kay passed away March 1, 1997 and after traveling solo for two years, Punk married Pat Rhodd on July 24, 1999. Enjoying their retirement they crisscrossed the U.S. visiting family, friends, and AG buddies. Punk and Pat both enjoyed serving Oklahoma in the Agricultural Aviation Association. Punk served as executive director in 1998 and was made a honorary member. His last accomplishment was serving on the BritVil Community Food Pantry, organizing the purchase of land and building their new site. The most surprising accomplishment for Punk came from his AGR brothers honoring him with the Pi Chapter Hall of Fame in 2014.

Punk is survived by: his wife Pat Wilhelm Rhodd Bonner, his sister Jo Morris, his children and their spouses; his grandchildren and great grandchildren. A celebration of life for A.L. “Punk” Bonner, Jr. was held on June 7, 2015.
AAPCO Standing Committee Report to Annual Meeting

Standing Committee: Nominations Committee

Committee Members, beginning with the chair: Gina Alessandri (MI), Jeff Comstock (VT), Tim Drake (SC)

Date of Report: February 10, 2016

Issues to be raise for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session: Election of slate of candidates for officers and directors

General Summary of committee or work group activities for the year:
On October 13, 2015, the AAPCO Secretary, on behalf of the Nominations Committee, sent an e-mail to the AAPCO membership soliciting potential candidates for two 2016 Board of Directors positions, specifically, a Full Term Director position and an At-Large Director position. The Nominations Committee consists of the last three past-presidents of AAPCO who are willing to serve and was represented this year by Gina Alessandri (Michigan), Jeff Comstock (Vermont) and Tim Drake (South Carolina). The committee received several candidate nominations for consideration. On February 3, 2016, the Committee held a conference call to discuss the slate of candidates for election as officers and directors, including potential candidates who were interested in the Full Term and At Large positions.

After deliberation, the Nominations Committee is pleased to present to the AAPCO membership the following slate of candidates for election as officers and directors for March 2016 to March 2017:

Dennis Howard (Maryland), President
Bonnie Rabe (New Mexico), President-Elect
Tony Cofer (Alabama), Director
Rose Kachadoorian (Oregon), Director
Tim Creger (Nebraska), Director At Large
Kathy Booker (Tennessee), Director At-Large
Chuck Moses (Nevada), Immediate Past-President

Respectively Submitted,

Gina Alessandri
Jeff Comstock
Tim Drake