

BOD call began at 1:06 pm ET

On the call: Tony Cofer, AL; Rose Kachadoorian, OR; Leo Reed, IN; Patrick Jones, NC; Liza Fleeson Trossbach, VA; Amy Sullivan, AAPCO

Cofer began with the Treasurers Position Description, and thanked folks for reviewing. Reed asked that other duties as assigned be added. Seeing no other comments, Cofer will rewrite and send one last time and then get it announced.

Kachadoorian asked when we were hoping to do interviews and the board had discussion on that. June or August would be possibilities. The June SFIREG meeting has a learning exchange on Tuesday afternoon, and Reed mentioned that there may be a Dicamba call in-person while we are there. The board liked the idea of having the interviews on the Sunday prior to the meeting, and will try to move quickly on getting the announcement out.

Cofer asked Reed to discuss his Dicamba involvements. As a follow up to the early morning states/EPA meeting at AAPCO, they have had a call and emails since. They are putting together a list of possible criteria that could be requested from impacted states. Once it is put together, there will be an email out to the states to see if they can produce some of these data. This will be used to assist in determining registration of the product in November. They also want to find out how to better get information from researchers or PSEPs, as there may be info that wasn't reported last year to the SLAs, through those channels. There will be a large national call in June, and EPA is very engaged on the issue.

Fleeson Trossbach has not discussed ingredient disclosure with Keigwin, but Cofer did discuss a possible workgroup for the issue with him last week. The charge will be for EPA to not approve labels that states will not approve, and to try to ensure that the states are part of the communication as to whether the labels with ingredient disclosure will be accepted into states. The issue that requires engagement is that some of the retailers are asking for or requiring additional ingredient information from the registrants, and that could conflict with state or federal rules, or appear in a promotional manner; at the very least it needs discussion. The registrants are concerned with engaging the states to determine how to best use the label space and to discuss some of the label proposals with the states. Some of this could come to 'claims' that are associated with the ingredients, and the states' concerns with that. It's unknown at this time if this is a significant issue for state registration programs or not.

The board discussed the conflict of interest policy.

AL just got their first request to use drones for application, as did NC for a new site. IN also mentioned the hoops required. OR has been repeatedly contacted by a drone operator interested in obtaining an aerial applicator's license.

Discussion continued, due to some of the federal legislators looking for compromises on the controversial issues of the revised WPS. The workgroup wanted to ensure that their line of thinking, and concerns with gaps in discussions on some of the issues, are congruent with the board. The AEZ continues to be a major issue for states, while designated reps and

*AAPCO Board of Directors Call
April 2, 2018
1 pm ET*

minimum age are not as much of a concern. EPA is willing to say the AEZ can be implemented as is, and the states do not agree. There may still be some states who have a problem with the minimum age, but not sure who at this time. Exposure vs. contact may be an issue for EPA right now as they are wrangling with the AEZ issue. What contact actually is, and defining that, is a strong concern for states moving forward, given the new guidance from EPA and conversations around the two terms. The board agrees that keeping AEZ in the possible future rulemaking is important.

The call ended at 2:05 pm ET.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Amy Sullivan".

Amy Sullivan, Executive Secretary