

Results of AAPCO Meetings Survey. There were 24 responses as of 3:30 p.m. 9/15/06. All responses were from SLA's, no industry or EPA (although in looking at the original recipient list I didn't see any "industry" showing, and perhaps EPA is prohibited for some unknown reason from responding). The following is a summary of the responses. I am including the verbatim comments after the stats. States that responded: OR, IN, NE, MS, DE, AZ, ID, TN, WV, MN, CO, NY, OK, MT, MI, NC, VA, RI, FL, MD, KS, IA, MO, AR.

-TLC-

QUESTION 1. Having two annual AAPCO meetings (spring and summer) is important to me / my agency / my company.

 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree, 4 Neutral, 9 Disagree, 6 Strongly Disagree

QUESTION 2. I prefer the following number of AAPCO meetings.

 16 One, 8 Two, 0 None

QUESTION 3. If you responded to Question 2 with the answer "One Meeting", which meeting would you prefer to attend?

 18 Spring, 0 Summer

QUESTION 4. Assuming that the spring meeting continues to be held, that meeting should be located:

 8 At or near EPA offices in the Washington, D.C. metro area.
 6 Within the Washington, D.C. metro area but not necessarily close to EPA offices.
 10 Somewhere else in the U.S. that might provide cost savings and reasonable travel access.

QUESTION 5. Assuming that the summer meeting continues to be held, AAPCO should:

 4 Continue to partner with AACO (the other associations represent feed and fertilizer regulators).
 9 Partner with other associations (such as ECOS or ASPCRO).
 8 Meet independently of other associations.

=====

I voted for 2 meetings, but if one were to be dropped, I would prefer to keep the Spring meeting in DC. If travel expense is an issue for other states (DC is a 2½ hour drive for me), it may be more practical to move the meeting around. I don't think location has a lot to do with attendance. If people are interested and have the budget, they'll attend regardless of where we host the meeting.

Is there a means of providing members with other alternatives of cost cutting? Perhaps a couple of pie charts showing source of revenues and expenditures? That would be a job for Phil.

=====

I am impartial to the summer meeting. It is good to get the association and board together a couple times a year; however, the cost may be getting prohibitive. I am uncertain what impact it will have on the board meeting. If I had to make a choice at this point I would eliminate the summer meeting at least to see what impact it had. It could always be started up again. (I know this seems contradictory to my answer to 2. However, I make this statement based on economics.) I am uncertain who it best to meet in conjunction with. There were only 17 carryovers who attended an adjoining AACO meeting. MI, OH, KS, MS, OK, NV, IN were the only states that the same person attended more than one meeting, all attended the fertilizer portion. OK and MI were only there for hosting and learning how to host. IN is the only state that had one person register for and attend all three, Rod Noel. Personally I don't think we gain that much from meeting with the other associations, but it paints a good picture of cooperation and supposed efficiency for the states. It would make it easier planning for just one meeting a year. I think it critical that the Spring meeting at least be in the DC area to allow the EPA participation.

=====

I think most people feel that they are simply going to a bunch of lectures, with information that can be learned over the internet. If so, why pay to travel? Somehow, I think the attendees need to be more engaged and feel like their presence makes a difference. If the real decisions are made in the working committees, then guess where the decision makers want to be connected? I think many states feel like AAPCO is mostly for socializing.

=====

I believe the other element that is missing is interaction with the people in attendance. These meetings usually end up being a bunch of lectures and the attendees do not really give much significant feedback. If the attendees were more involved, they may see more value in the meetings and not view the meetings as mostly a social event.

=====

If only 1 meeting was held you could possibly extend it for another day. With State and Federal budgets meetings in Washington are costly if you attend both. This meeting is not only for EPA, but for states as well and I believe you have more state participation. **Question 5.** You should review the numbers for those attending the Summer meeting, the other regulators may not want to meet at the same time.

=====

Costs are about the same as other meetings (ASPCRO) (ASFFPCO).

=====

Costs (to participating members/interested others) continues to be reasonable. Locations are adequate; sometimes better associated recreational activities outside of meeting might be useful, particularly for summer meetings.

=====

- **Costs:** State budgets usually play a critical role in being able to send participants to the meetings.
- **Locations:** I would look for location(s) that can offer a meaningful field trip for hands-on activities as well as cost savings.
- **Value:** The meetings can be very valuable, especially for individuals new to the programs who need to network. On the other hand, for those of us who have "been around awhile", the meeting portion can be just the "same old thing" - depending on the agenda and speakers.
- **Effectiveness:** I love to go to the meetings when there is an opportunity to learn how to do my job better. However, most of the meetings tend to have the same speakers every year. I review agendas carefully before requesting to attend a meeting, primarily because when I am away from my desk, there is no one else to fill in. So when I return from a meeting that I didn't feel an opportunity to learn "new" and "value" information, it can be quite depressing.

=====

HAS THE BOARD EVER CONSIDERED HAVING THE BUSINESS MEETING *BEFORE* THE GENERAL SESSION (INSTEAD OF AT THE END)? I WONDER IF YOU WOULD HAVE MORE PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE AT THAT IMPORTANT SESSION IF YOU DID SO?

I BELIEVE THE FEED AND FERTILIZER ASSOCIATIONS BOTH HAVE MID-YEAR MEETINGS THAT MOVE TO DIFFERENT LOCATIONS EACH FEBRUARY. IT SEEMS TO WORK FOR THEM. PERHAPS THEIR INSIGHT ON THIS TOPIC WOULD BE HELPFUL.

IT'S TIME TO FIND A LOCATION OTHER THAN THE DOUBLETREE (TOO EXPENSIVE).

=====

I have been attending AAPCO meetings since Spring of 1979. As long as I have been involved, the Spring meeting has always been the only one which I could call a true "working meeting." The Summer meetings have always been, more often than not, longer on "family vacation fun" and shorter on "meaningful agenda." Rarely have issues arisen or changed so much between March and August that the second meeting was justified—in my opinion. In today's world of instant messaging, teleconferencing and the www, we can just as nearly instantaneously engage in discussion with our entire membership without having to come together physically. I do believe that there still is great value in holding some face to face meetings, and thus in order to maximize the value of such meetings, I would urge AAPCO to continue to hold the Spring meeting so we can encourage as much participation from EPA Headquarters staff as possible. That is where the real face to face value comes about—getting us together with the EPA HQ decision makers who affect

our work so directly but who so often don't have the "real world" experience or understanding that our members have. And I realize also that so much of the real work gets accomplished outside of the traditional meeting room—over drinks, during dinner, etc.—so I would always support maintaining the annual Spring meeting format.

=====

Travel expenses being what they are, and the fact that any travel to AAPCO meetings is paid for out of state operating budget (as opposed to EPA or SFIREG paying the way), it seems reasonable to hold one productive annual meeting rather than two meetings annually that have become little more than an update for members. I look at other associations meetings and see them conducting working sessions, national forums, "listening sessions" for Congress, etc., and wonder why our meeting/s can't function in a way that actually results in progress forward on important issues. I regularly attend both summer and spring meetings, and sympathize with members who have chosen to not attend because they feel the meeting is not worth their time. To make their attendance worth their time, we need to integrate working committee sessions to the meeting (I'm talking SFIREG Committees). The attendance goes up, real work is accomplished, and the appeal to members increases (at least in my opinion).

The second comment I'd like to make is in regard to our association with the Feed and Fertilizer associations. This marriage was arranged many years ago as a result of how many state pesticide programs evolved within state agencies. We (SLA's) have now matured to a point where only a handful of us are still in any way affiliated with feed and fertilizer programs in our home states. The issues we face, the people we need to interact with, and the cross-jurisdictional boundaries we should establish are more aligned with environmental and structural pest control associations than feed and fertilizer. I would strongly encourage AAPCO to consider holding their summer meeting with either ECOS or ASPCRO, at one time to give it a try.

=====

Thanks for conducting this survey! It is very valuable to us and we would like to see best possible attendance.

=====

Q#4. I'd prefer to meet with EPA at various locations. Best of both worlds.

Q#5. Assuming financial efficiencies are significant partnered with AACO, otherwise, independently is fine.

=====

Due to states placing constraints on travel, travel to attend AAPCO should be funded by EPA or included in cooperative grants.

=====

I have been attending the Spring Meetings for years but have only attended the last 2 Summer Meetings since being promoted to Program Manager. Prior to that the previous Program Manager

attended AAPCO's Summer Meeting and I attended ASPCRO's Annual Meeting. From my limited perspective the Spring Meetings seem to be better attended and more effective. Because of the prices in the D.C. Metro area they are more expensive. Perhaps partnering with ASPCRO might be of benefit as their meetings are also held in August and they have meeting locations booked for several years in advance. Additionally, many of the individuals (State and Industry) who attend ASPCRO also attend AAPCO. I know for me it would be easier to justify the travel and time out of the office if the AAPCO and ASPCRO meetings were held back to back. It would seem there would be a savings in airfare as well. Just a thought, perhaps we could try it on a trial basis if there is enough interest.

I like the idea of scheduling AAPCO meetings to benefit from new partnerships with other associations or if that's not possible, just meeting independently and making a greater effort to improve communications with environmental regulatory associations (ECOS/ASWIPCA) or NASDA. Can AAPCO do more to bring in Congressional speakers who can help our funding efforts? Should AAPCO consider retaining the services of a lobbyist, perhaps in cooperation with other associations, to help improve federal support for our programs?

Re: summer meeting locations, I think venues located in cooler areas or those near beach/lake amenities could improve attendance.

AAPCO meeting agendas are slow to be published. Summer agendas offer little to make attendance a priority (unless already attending one or both of the other AAPCO meetings).

Q.4: Elsewhere in the US that will attract the higher echelon EPA personnel and encourage them to stay for a while and not return to their office immediately after their presentation so that the states will have an opportunity to visit with them. Rather than criticize, let me comment on what I would like to get out of the meetings.

1. I would like there to be a two way exchange of information between AAPCO & EPA, not just provide a forum for EPA to tell us what they are going to do to us next.
2. I would like to get some indication that EPA understands and cares about each state's unique problems.

Arlington, VA area is still the best location for the spring meeting. By going outside of Arlington, we risk the chance of EPA staff have an excuse for not attending. I believe the Double Tree and Radisson are still suitable locations for the spring meeting provided we can secure "reasonable" group rates.