1. **C&T:**
   a. Issues / Concerns / What have you heard? Rule changes: Some states will have to do legislative changes. EPA needs to be aware of the legislative issues and provide states the time for that process to take place. Because some states need to open up their statutes, which can be very difficult, the potential is that states can lose some things in their laws that they have worked very hard to obtain. Legislatures have to review all pesticide acts in a state. States can’t implement new C&T regulations until Legislatures takes action. The “what if the Legislature(s) will not act in time.” It is then out of the state’s control. What will the process be for approval of C&T plans? Can the states find ways to make their existing categories equivalent to the new categories under the new C&T rule?
   b. States want C&T training and resources in a series of mini preps in each region.
   c. States would like to modify their Certifications programs through CPARD with existing information already on the database. This work well with Container Containment, only had to change one rule not the definition of use of a pesticide.

2. **WPS:**
   a. How To Comply Manual
   b. Train-the-Trainer program
   c. The rule requires the acknowledgement of a CCA program to be in writing (whether recognized by EPA or a State), and that it would be based on the program covering the required handler training content (old content up until January 2018, new content after January 2018). Coincidentally the national CCA program administrator had contacted our office [Richard Pont, EPA] about getting the national CCA program recognized, and we had a call with him as well as the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants (NAICC) representative yesterday on this subject. We [EPA] are working on national recognition of both programs as meeting the WPS exemption requirements so that the local/regional CCA programs would not need to get state by state recognition. EPA will notify the Regions and States/Tribes, and put that info on our website, as soon as we have given those organizations the written approval.
   [Personal Communique: Richard Pont, Certification and Worker Protection Branch, U.S. EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs]

3. **State Rotation on SFIREG:** Region 8 States will follow a 2-year rotation.
4. **Jim Jones Letter:**

5. **North Dakota SFIREG Topics:**
   a. Carinata is an oilseed that has been grown in Canada and recently expanded into the US. Currently there are few/no registered pesticide products in North Dakota and possibly the US but the company selling the seeds has a grower guide on their website directing people to use certain pesticides. Follow-up Per EPA: Legal labeled use sites for carinata include: the label must either list Brassica carinata, so for example Rapeseed (includes canola, Brassica carinata…..) or a statement such as “for use on rapeseed subgroup 20A or oilseed group 20.”

6. **Other Region 8 Topics:**
   a. 25(b) product registrations / tracebacks. Many companies selling via internet. Not registering in states that require 25(b) product registration. States struggle getting products registered. Can EPA facilitate better consistency?
   b. Pollinator Protection. Most states developing or have in place online resources / maps showing apiary locations (if law requires) or voluntary sign-up and use by beekeepers, specialty or organic crop sites, and pesticide applications.
   c. Marijuana & Hemp continue to be top issue for states.
   d. Safer Choice / DFE labeling. There are still concerns from states. Placing the DFE logo on products appears to be a violation of a regulation. There was an EPA legal determination conducted in 2010. However, most states read the CFR and are not comfortable with EPA endorsing products.