



**ASPCRO BOARD OF DIRECTORS
2015 ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES
August 23, 2015
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

The ASPCRO Board of Directors 2015 Annual Meeting was held August 23, 2015 at the Marriott Harbor Beach Resort and Spa in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Attendees:

Board of Directors: Johns Scott, President, Colorado Department of Agriculture, Liza Fleeson, Vice President, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; Grant Bishop, Treasurer, West Virginia Department of Agriculture; Linda Johns, Secretary, Montana Department of Agriculture; Doug Edwards, Executive Secretary; Michael Weyman, At-Large Member, South Carolina Department of Pesticide Regulation; John Dalley, At-Large Member, North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; Derrick Lastinger, Past President, Georgia Department of Agriculture

State Lead Agency Representatives: Bonnie Rabe, New Mexico Department of Agriculture, Davis Daiker, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Steven Dwinell, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Ryan Okey, Clemson University Department of Pesticide Regulation, Victor Lennon, North Carolina Department of Agriculture Structural Pest Section, Seth Dunlop, Arkansas State Plant Board, Russell Kohler, Mississippi Department of Agriculture and Commerce Bureau of Plant Industry, Irene King, New Mexico Department of Agriculture, Gary King, Michigan Department of Agriculture, Tim Drake, South Carolina Department of Pesticide Regulation (we may need to look at the roll call list to include other states that were present..... I know Arizona and Wyoming were at the meeting)

EPA Representatives: Brad Miller, EPA School IPM, Randy Dominy, EPA Region 4

Industry Representatives: Jim Harron, Rollins, Inc., Bob Rosenberg, National Pest Management Association, Jim Fredericks, National Pest Management Association, Jonathan Berger, BASF, Andrew Architect, National Pest Management Association, Rick Bell, Arrow Exterminators, Ron Hampton, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., Fred Pearson, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., Mel Kyle, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., Jan Brill, Bayer, Jill Holihan, FMC, Lonnie Alonso, Ohio Pest Management Association,

Brian Alonso, Ohio Pest Management Association, Julie Spagnoli, JM Specialty Consulting, Norman Goldberg, Namron Business Associates, Allen Fugler, CRU Insurance, Michael Beckers, Certified Pest Control Operators Association of Florida and Judy Fersch of BASF was present.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

John Scott, President, Colorado Department of Agriculture called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. welcoming attendees to the 2015 ASPCRO Board of Directors Annual Meeting.

Board members, state lead agency representatives, EPA representatives and industry representatives followed through with self-introductions. An attendee sign-in sheet was distributed amongst the group for collecting information to update the ASPCRO contact list.

Approval of 2014 ASPCRO Annual Meeting Minutes

Comments from Liza Fleeson and Derrick Lastinger concerned a few typographical errors for Linda Johns to complete corrections prior to annual meeting.

MOTION to accept minutes by Liza Fleeson; Second by Derrick Lastinger. Board unanimously accepted minutes.

Treasurer's Report

Grant Bishop, Treasurer, provided an overview of the budget reports including account balances, banking summary income (year to date), and summary of 2015 income and expenses.

1. Account balances as of August 20, 2015
 - a. Checking – current balance is \$47,396 with \$80 incurred from interest
 - b. CD – current balance is \$22,209, started at \$20,000 so interest is incurring
 - c. Credit Card account zero out at end of each month
2. Banking Summary Income
 - a. Dues have been collected from 40 states.
 - b. Meeting subsidies from sponsors is the biggest income generated
 - c. Meeting registration fees have increased slightly, mostly due to increased registration fee of \$185.00
3. Summary of 2014 income and expenses
 - a. The checking account total will decrease once the venue/hotel expenses have been paid following the annual meeting
 - b. If the annual meeting expenses are less than the checking account balance there will be a profit for 2015
 - c. Overall, the banking accounts are in great shape

John Scott asked if the meeting subsidies were the highest ever. Grant Bishop commented that he would have to run reports to confirm but he thought it was. John thanked the sponsors. Grant mentioned that the treasurer duties have become less arduous since Doug Edwards came on board as the Executive Secretary. Thanks Doug.

MOTION to accept treasurer report by Derrick Lastinger; Second by John Dalley. Board unanimously accepted minutes.

Executive Secretary Report

Doug Edwards, Executive Secretary, reported that his activities involve maintenance to the ASPCRO website such as handling updates and keeping the Directories of the State officials accurate. Two-thirds of my job is in the preceding two months before the annual conference.

This year ASPCRO used a RFVP book web service to conduct the conference registrations and to manage the various sessions. This turned out to be a success and there are even aspects of the programs that haven't been explored. The program is a very well thought out set of tools and offers a process for recordings and emails. Correspondence through email has been minimal with most being from someone trying to sell us a web service, invites to participate in a conference, or spam.

MOTION to accept treasurer report by Grant Bishop; Second by Liza Flesson. Board unanimously accepted minutes.

Planning Committee Report

Liza Fleeson, Chair, welcomed everyone to the 59th Annual conference and thanked the planning committee members and Steve Dwinell (host) and his staff for such a phenomenal job on organizing and administering the conference.

Highlights of the meeting include having 166 attendees registered for the conference which is above the four year average of 164. The registration system had very few issues and made it easy to send mass emailing's instead of going back and forth with prospective attendees. The registration system also made it easy to receive proper counts on lunches and receptions which rely on the number of participants. The committee meetings are being held today, as well as, two optional activities (golf and Everglades' tour). Liza hoped everyone enjoyed the activities. Registration is open today from 1:00 pm to 5:00 pm in the foyer. All meetings and meals are in rooms Ocean 1, 2, 3 and 4. Tonight's opening reception sponsored by Orkin is from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm with hopes that all will be able to attend.

The conference will start Monday morning with breakfast at 6:45 am. The spouse's off-site tour is Monday from 10:30 am to 3:30 pm. The hospitality suite will be hosted by Doug Edwards and has specific dates and times. Please stop by and say hello. Monday's lunch will be sponsored by Terminix and there will be two special topic sessions in the afternoon. The first topic is on the Golden Malrin and homeowner misuse and the second topic is on pollinators and non-ag applications. Tuesday will start with breakfast at 6:45 am followed by the morning session with conjunction to the afternoon pest tour

focusing on invasive species. The buses will start loading at 12:15 pm in front of the convention center where a box lunch will be available. Steve Dwinell explained that there will be two buses that will instinctively go to two different locations. The first location will be at a wetlands exhibit area next to the Brass Pro Shop dealing with eradication of conehead termites. The second location is at the T-Y Park with a demonstration of pest interdiction dogs and the pests that are currently be dealt with. The buses will be back to the hotel by 3:00 pm. Two new sessions were added at the last minute with the first one starting at 3:15 pm by Douglas Products discussing a recent purchase, change of ownership, and pesticide stewardship activities. The second session will start at 3:45 pm and is a closed session for SLA's and EPA only on an update of the Methyl Bromide misuse incident in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The buses will start loading at 4:15 pm for the Tuesday night off-site event sponsored by Arrow Exterminators. Wednesday is the closing day with updates on pollinators, rodenticides, and structural fumigation. The meeting will wrap up by noon on Wednesday.

Committee Reports

Note: Committee Reports referenced in minutes will be posted separately. Board did not receive all committee reports.

Communications Committee

Derrick Lastinger, Co-chair, reported that November of last year the website was transitioned from Purdue to ASPCRO and Doug (executive secretary) is working on managing all the content now. There was a lot of work initially, and continues on a routine basis to keep everything up to date. The website is working so much better with us being able to handle all our own updates. This has created less emails and correspondence.

The ASPCRO library on the website has been developed and has all the minutes from 1962 to present. Thanks to Bonnie Rabe, the historian, for scanning all the historical copies. We still need to add a google search function to find information off of documents easier. There's a new feature on the website called Announcement Section and ASPCRO recently added a survey that was conducted of state training centers and university centers offering training opportunities for state inspectors. The Adobe connect license was renewed and will be good until April 30, 2016 at the cost of \$150.00. For the conference this year, and the preceding three years, the sessions have been broadcasting live. An email has already been sent out for the live webinars that can be shared with everyone's staff. The link was sent out to all members/people registered for the annual conference and the links will be good for every day of the meeting. The sessions will also be recorded, with speaker's approval.

ASPCRO has a new conference registration page of RSVPbook.com that ASPCRO pays \$1.99 per registrant to use. It's working very well and the committee recommends that we use this tool again in 2016 and have it expanded for use at the mid-year meetings so that we can track who's attending even

though there's no registration fee. Doug thinks it's a good tool for managing rosters and attendance that allows for communication of registered attendees. This helps put some structure around the mid-year meeting. Liza would also like to see more information on the registration page, such as, spousal information.

The committee still needs help getting the website committee pages up to date. The committee chairs are being asked to look at their pages and update the members, mission, purpose, and activities. Doug will send the page in a word document where the chair can edit any information then send this back to Doug for publication. Doug sent out an all-point bulletin earlier for any missing documents, such as committee reports and board minutes from any prior sessions. Doug will send out another reminder. The website domain ASPCRO.org was renewed for five years and will be done for renewal in 2019.

The committee met back in April at the mid-year meeting and met again yesterday at the annual meeting. The committee talked about "what is the best way to communicate with our members, associates and supporters". Currently, ASPCRO does everything through email and the website and is asking the board to have a discussion about using social media. Could a Facebook page be created for posting information, but not be used as a forum for exchanging views. It can be used just for posting purposes related to ASPCRO business. How do we put restrictions on the page and still allow the page to be followed? Facebook is another way for ASPCRO to communicate. Would it be worth the effort to maintain a Facebook page? John Scott asked who is going to maintain incoming messages and make responses back, what would the workload be and what the board's thoughts are? A statement could be made on the page that ASPCRO will not be responding to any messages. Liza said this would be another source for distributing information that's also on the website. Grant felt people will read their Facebook posts over email posts. Doug said this could have value, especially leading into the mid-year meeting and the annual meeting. It's an alternative to broadcasting emails every time there's a need for communication with members. Right now, we're relying on everyone to search us out on the website. We still need to send information out through emails and the webpage. John asked what posting information that ASPCRO is following, such as, news articles, EPA's decisions, etc. and Liza stated that this information could be useful and effective and definitely worth considering. John though we could always give Facebook a try and see how it works, maybe even have ready by mid-year. Derrick though we could ask the members at the business meeting their thoughts by a show-of-hands.

The committee would like to develop some content for membership to be placed on the website that would talk about who can be a member, how to become a member, and what the benefits are. It doesn't have to be a lot of information, but currently, we don't have anything available for interested parties. Derrick asked for a volunteer and Liza graciously accepted. Liza will put something together to give to Derrick who will circulate it within the committee.

Derrick asked the board to consider if we really need a communication committee anymore since Doug basically handles all the communication needs. John thought the webinar group could be part of the planning committee and Liza felt that as long as the website/Facebook pages were being supported

elsewhere (executive secretary) that the committee would no longer be needed and an ad hoc group could always be formed if a specific need came up. This will be brought back to the board at the next mid-year meeting.

MOTION to accept Communication Committee report by Linda Johns; Second by Mike Weyman. Board unanimously accepted report.

Bedbug Committee

Liza Fleeson, Chair, reported that the bedbug committee met during the mid-year meeting in Detroit and on Saturday, August 27 in Fort Lauderdale at the annual meeting. The committee has been tracking different EPA items or initiatives such as the product performance draft guideline on bedbug pesticide products registered as Section 3 products, not 25b products. Currently, the status is posed, or in for the internal review process. Anticipated publication is by the end of 2015. The committee is tracking product performance data needed for pesticide products pending efficacy against pests and significant public health issues. Working group at EPA is responding to received comments and it is working its way through the next steps in the rule making process.

Talked briefly about 25b's and the OECA compliance assistance effort where they drafted a template letter that was sent to regions where states were buying 25b products that don't really need the 25b exemption, and that they can use it more like a compliance assistance to write to the companies and say this is what the exemption is and you won't need it. We don't know how widely it's being implemented or if regions are actually utilizing the letter. Region 3, 4 and 5, represented in the committee, are not currently using the letter. The letter went out to the regions in March 2015.

The committee is tracking on the the work that EPA is doing about product efficacy for 25b's and minimal risk pesticides. ASPCRO has commented on the proposed 25b rule. Current status is that in June, 2015 the draft final was forwarded to the secretaries of the USDA and the Health and Human Services for their review. Once it's been signed off on, it will be made public, and out for publication sometime in the near future.

At the last board meeting, the board approved and recommended to move forward in drafting model regulations for some of the non-pesticidal treatments for bedbugs. ASPCRO received a request for a model regulation for heat treatments and canine scent detection. Sent a survey out to the states asking if this information would be helpful and what would be the order of priorities. The survey results showed heat treatment as first priority, canine scent detection as second priority, and ozone and cold as third priority.

During discussions yesterday, the committee will tackle two more concerns 1) heat treatment model regulation and the canine scent detection. Maryland already has a canine scent regulation, and DC and NPMA already have BMP's as resources for a starting point. Will send out these resources to the

committee to identify critical elements and start the process from there.

One other thing brought up was the issues with construction and the need to look at construction practices (how to keep the pests out). Need to do some research and see what kinds of BMP's or guidelines are available. This came up because of Public Housing situations and pest concerns. How can we help educate in this area? How about reaching out to the Home Builder Associations concerning pest control issues? Will also go back out to the ASPCRO membership about bedbug resources and get more information on the website.

The committee talked about the online regulation form that AAPCO and ASPCRO have been conversing on to have a regulation form that would share information about any issues still under discussion. Open forum used for issues followed up with discussion. Steve Dwinell will follow up with AAPCO. Is there an option of having an Industry Regulator (open forum) dialog for a way to get information and feedback?

MOTION to accept the Bed Bug Committee report by Derrick Lastinger; Second by Grant Bishop. Board unanimously accepted report.

Green Building Standards Committee

Steve Dwinell, Chair, reported that he could no longer be chair and asked that someone else take his place. Currently, there are no pressing needs/issues, although the problem with this committee is that at any time someone could propose some change to the building code, or to the Green Building Standards that are used by the U.S. Green Building Council that could impact state regulations or the pest control industry. This is basically, a monitoring role and a rapid response role. The last thing that came up was when someone tried to put a provision to building codes that involved termite protection against steel or something similar, and once it gets into the International Building Code, it becomes the building code. Might be useful to have a Building Code Committee and have the Green Building Standards committee be a subset of that.

Steve will put together a notification with details on the chair's responsibilities and how everything functions. Liza can put this out to the members/industry for nominations of a new chair. It was recommended that the committee name be changed first before going out for nominations.

MOTION to renew the International Building Code membership through ASPRCO.

MOTION to accept by Grant Bishop; Second by Derrick Lastinger. Board unanimously accepted report.

MOTION to change committee name from Green Building Standards to Building Code.

MOTION to accept by Liza Fleeson; Second by Mike Weyman. Board unanimously accepted report.

Inspector Training Committee

Liza, Vice-President, reported for George Saxton, Chair, that at the mid-year meeting the committee sought the board's approval to do a survey of the states to see what their training needs were for their inspectors and investigators. A survey was sent out, and the preliminary results came back with responses from 36 states with 97 percent saying that they need training. Some questions on the survey pertained to 1) how many days would be ideal for training 2) how would the attendees be funded- would the state be willing to pay for the training 3) would the states send someone to training? This was to determine the best method of training (in-person, webinar, etc.). The survey asked what type of training and the responses were anything from basics to criminal investigations, interviewing techniques, investigator safety, label interpretation, report writing, and testifying in court. What kind of scenario training would be of interest (bedbugs, termites, mosquitos)? Would states be willing to host training program, and quite a few said yes?

A conference call will follow about how to proceed based on interest of states and topics of most importance.

MOTION to accept the Inspector Training Committee report by Grant Bishop; Second by Mike Weyman. Board unanimously accepted report.

Label Stewardship Committee

Bonnie Rabe, Chair, reported that the committee had a conference call to discuss the work done on the pollinator guidance document since EPA came out with their policy and BMP's. ASPCRO did comment by sending a letter that was submitted to the docket. Primarily, we focused on ASPCRO supporting clear, concise, and enforceable language. We agreed with the allowance that applications could be made when associated with Public Health Responses like mosquito control. The importance of evaluating their language and further language lets us see what happens with what EPA has proposed, and what will happen with this. Will be a good way to evaluate what's going on. We encourage them to continue their interaction with both ASPCRO and AAPCO on any further language development.

ASPCRO supports the MP3 concept with encouragement to include urban pest management industry professionals as stakeholders. Urban sites are right next door to agricultural settings. Consideration and acknowledgement about the limitations that states and tribes may have in implementing the MP3's. This takes resources and stakeholders to accomplish this, and not all states have groups that come together nicely. The plans should be evaluated based on the states, with some being more robust, while others being more simplistic. The committee commented on support for science-based research, label restrictions developed and based upon risk scenarios, including non-ag use sites. This includes allowing some exemptions under specified provisions when landscape plants are in bloom, and recognition that these may be a pest.

Discussed and stayed abreast with what's going on with the structural fumigant labeling as EPA goes through the reassessment. The committee will stay aware of the process and will work with EPA.

Working on how do we get clear, concise languages for compliance with applicators using termiticides. The committee will be working on how termiticide labels should be aligned, and will be looking at all the different sections of the label to help determine how a label should be laid out for more consistency amongst products. Discussed the SmartLabel, which is an input data mechanism for registrants to add labels to the EPA system. The SmartLabel is primarily for EPA to collect data and to pull out key information, such as, identifying certain products with PPE requirements or drift language.

MOTION to accept the Label Stewardship Committee report by Liza Fleeson; Second by Mike Weyman. Board unanimously accepted report.

Rodenticide Committee

Linda Johns, Chair, reported that the committee met during the mid-year meeting in Detroit in April and again yesterday. Worked on wrapping up some action items from the mid-year meeting, including the request from Meredith Laws, EPA, that field data needed to be presented for the three *Peromyscus* species that ASPCRO was asking to have listed on the rodenticide labels. The question was how do registrants handle the field data. A conversation with Meredith clarified that EPA will not be requesting field data anymore and that lab data will be sufficient. So where does a registrant go to get *Peromyscus* species to conduct the lab data? There is one place in the U.S that you can get *Peromyscus* species. EPA is going to request that if you want the three *Peromyscus* species on the label, you must produce the efficacy data.

EPA also mentioned that they were not going to accept the *Neotoma* species to be listed on the label either. We asked EPA if they were just not going to accept the *Neotoma* species to be listed as is, or if it would be feasible to list them out separately. EPA decided to allow for them to be listed separately, than later decided to have no *Neotoma* species listed on the label. John Scott and I had a conversation with EPA where they relinquished to allow for the three *Neotoma* species to be listed on the label. John clarified that the reason EPA wasn't going to allow the *Neotoma* species to be listed on the label was because some of the species are endangered. The *Neotoma* species listed on the label will not include any endangered species. EPA also revised the label language for Cotton Rats because there are endangered species listed for them as well. EPA asked that we use only the one species that is most likely to be baited in a commensal setting.

In the meeting this morning, it was asked why other species were not considered for being placed on the label and if we can every go back to add more species at a later date. The committee felt that the need has already been met and that this is not the time to go back to EPA for more changes. John commented that the species added to the label were selected because they were rodents that had significant public health elements to them. NPMA commented that this was originally done in a nationwide survey to name any species with public health concerns.

An action item was brought up concerning electronic devices that receive a signal from a trap that has been triggered. Are there issues with this, especially if the devices have labels attached to them? Should ASPCRO be looking into this to see how labels are corresponding to these devices? Existing system in the U.S. is called TrapSmart. As states, how do we determine what to do if label language is on the devices? Do we regulate, or not regulate?

MOTION to accept the updated Rodenticide Risk Mitigation Decision Compliance paper. The board will review and distribute answer at a later date.

MOTION to accept the Rodenticide Committee report by John Dalley; Second by Grant Bishop. Board unanimously accepted report.

School IPM Committee

Gary King, Chair, reported that a couple of action items occurred during the year. The largest was for the committee to work on a School IPM model contract. The committee agreed to use the Florida model contract as the basis for the potential ASPCRO model contract that schools and pest management businesses could enter into a contract agreement together for doing IPM in schools. The contract was sent out to the committee members to review and to make comments, than send the comments onto Mike Page. Nothing was done with the comments or the contract during the last year. Gary reached out to Mike about the progress of the contract but received no response. He learned later that Mike had retired from the department.

Gary was able to get a copy of what Mike considered to be the model contract. EPA is interested in ASPCRO moving forward with the model contract, so that they can adopt it. Gary's not sure exactly what EPA's intents are for the document, but he submitted the document to the ASPRCO Board of Directors for review and comments. He received comments back from the board and sent these on to be shared with the committee to move forward with finalizing the document. There were concerns from the board about having a model contract with ASPCRO's name attached to it.

Gary came to the board today about additional direction on moving the document forward. He thought there were three options to be considered: 1) put a disclaimer in the model contract indicating this is a potential model contract that states could modify for their use 2) put in the title that this is not a contract but a guideline to develop a contract or 3) is ASPCRO in the business of drafting model contract? Liza commented that we've have done other model regulations and guidance type documents and that there is value in producing a paper. It's important as an association to state the elements of importance, but not this particular document. John Scott commented that ASPCRO has not historically dealt with contracts with legalese language. Wanted to know if ASPCRO would have any legal liability if something went wrong if issues arose that pertained to a contract that had ASPCRO's name on it. He agreed with a guideline that has elements of consideration for School IPM. Maybe develop a guideline document with links to states that already have contracts. Why have a CPR portion in a contract, and

should ASCPCRO recommend this? There were elements that were specific to Florida, such as statutes and statutory provisions. It needs to be more generic so that it is applicable at a national level. I'm struggling with the actual legalese. A sense of urgency from EPA about the status of the contract seems imminent. Can we expedite this process to be completed in the next 30 days? John Dalley thought there needs to be a document that states can model after. He presented a copy of "Integrated Pest Management for North Carolina Schools and Child Care Facilities" that was put together by NC State University Department of Entomology. Let's change the name from contract to guidelines with links to other states that have documents/contracts. Bonnie commented that we should support a more general approach to the document.

Brad from EPA commented that the agreement between ASCPCRO and EPA for a model contract was so that EPA could develop a toolbox for schools that contained policies, procedures and coordinators for schools to utilize IPM services. There has been a disconnect between wanting IPM and buying IPM services where the services bought may only set up a spraying schedule and not incorporate IPM. It doesn't matter what the document gets called as long as there is something for the schools to utilize that aligns itself with IPM. Bob, NPMA, commented that it's not appropriate for federal and state agencies to start specifying exact verbiage of a contract between two private parties. Let the lawyers deal with contracts; this is not a place for ASCPCRO. A list of "here's the things you need to know" would be something that industry could support. NPMA is not against promoting School IPM and they would be pleased to work with the committee to put together a document with key elements for creating an IPM contract. An advisory document is fine, but not a contract.

Johns Scott commented that the board is in agreement that we do not want a contract with contractual language, but that we are in agreement with having a guidance document stating key elements that have no legalese language. We have a commitment to EPA to provide a guidance document to honor our agreement. We can reach out to states later about that having their documents linked to the guidelines.

The board charges the committee with the responsibility to move forward with creating a guidance document for School IPM.

Gary needs a list of School IPM committee members. Liza will send this onto Gary, but also let him know that it is on the website. Asked Gary to reconfirm the existing committee members and build up from there. Gary had three other outreach efforts that he thought were still incomplete 1) ASCPCRO would develop a position statement that the SLA's could adopt discussing the importance of implementing an IPM program in schools. Liza commented that the position paper was already completed and it was a resolution in 2013 2) ASCPCRO doing an IPM survey. Liza commented that this was already completed and that she would send the information onto Gary 3) there was a grant available for developing outreach and educational materials for schools in IPM. The universities doing the grant wanted to run a survey through ASCPCRO about IPM education in schools. ASCPCRO will support this endeavor.

MOTION to accept the SIPM Committee report by Linda Johns; Second by Johns Dalley. Board unanimously accepted report.

Structural Fumigation Committee

John Scott, Chair, reported that the committee had two conference calls this year pertaining to updating members on the background and purpose of the committee. Gave an update on where California is on the sulfuryl fluoride review that is still ongoing. There are no definitive elements that can be shared at this time. Primary issue was EPA talking with NPMA and ASPRCO about reregistration of structural fumigation products, and that there is a need for EPA personnel to have specific training on these products.

In cooperation with NPMA and Derrick Lastinger, GDA, who worked with Rollins and Jim Fredericks, NPMA, put together a phenomenal agenda for the training. Rollins was able to bring their personnel to develop the training and to use the Rollins facility. The training was held in March, 2015 with 16 EPA personnel from headquarters and the region attending. They tented a full house at the facility so that EPA could see what this entailed to fumigate an entire structure. Rick, EPA, commented that this was the best training he'd ever attended in his career, and all the EPA folks made the same comment. It was well put on and they learned so much. EPA came back later and asked for additional training on burrowing rodent fumigants. Bonnie Rabe, NM agreed to host the training that would held either be in November, 2015 or the spring of 2016 focusing on aluminum phosphides for burrowing rodent applications.

Bonnie commented that ASPCRO is involved because burrowing rodents are in urban settings, and that there are issues of concern with the label language. The airport at Albuquerque came close to shutting down a few years ago because of prairie dog damage where the mayor decided on a city-wide ban to control them. Bonnie will be working with the wildlife service folks to deal for conducting the training. There is a need to show EPA the importance of burrowing rodent fumigation use and how it's important to the livestock industry as well. This training will also cover M-44 products and other predator control products that pertain to high risk use.

Steve Dwinell brought before the committee, NPMA, and EPA the idea of developing a structural fumigation training specific to operators in the Virgin Islands. This came about after the incident in the Virgin Islands. Jim, NPMA, said they had a call recently with ASPCRO, AAPCO, NPMA, EPA headquarters, EPA Region 2, and representatives from the Virgin Islands to discuss the need for, and the resources available, to conduct a training that is really basic and applies to applicator needs in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. A smaller workgroup has been established that includes AAPCO, ASPCRO, NPMA, representatives from the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico and Puerto Rico pest association to work out what the training would look like, what's the program, who are the contact providers, sponsorships and locations. Will involve the registrants and their expertise and will hatch out all the details on the next conference call and keep everyone informed.

MOTION to accept the Structural Fumigation Committee report by Derrick Lastinger; Second by Liza Fleeson. Board unanimously accepted report.

State Meeting Assistance Committee (SMAC)

Jay Kelley, Chair, was not present. No report at this time.

Structural Remediation Committee

Derrick Lastinger, Chair, reported that the committee had a meeting yesterday to talk about the grant that NPIC is working on with EPA EHE Division for a fact sheet on structural remediation. In April, Derrick talked to EPA and Kaci Buhl, NPIC, who sent a draft document that they are working on. It's a general fact sheet designed for anyone offering no real specifics. This is a good opportunity for the committee to review the document and make comments. Currently, there is no other document available, so this could be the go-to document once finalized.

The committee is in the process of developing their own guidelines, and recently had a discussion about speaking to the American Industrial Hygienist Association (AIHA). Did contact them but have had no follow up from them as of yet.

Amy M., EPA Region 5, provided an update on the two projects that they are working on. One is a multi-year project on developing modeling approaches for evaluating surface wipe materials. She talked about some of the preliminary results and the final information will be coming out soon. They are also looking at what works best for isopropyl alcohol, acetone or water. She provided an update, but this is still ongoing.

The committee put together six sections of the document on from the charge the committee was given by the board. The committee hasn't been very active this past year, but we are gearing up to get back into it. The committee decided to divide and concur the six sections by assigning a section to each person. We will outline what should be in the sections, for instance, there will be a purpose/background section, a notification and contact section, a determining action section, a pesticide information section, a remediation section, and a visual road map on how to work through an incident section. We will have a conference call once the section outlines have been set, than start drafting what the document will look like. The timeline is to have the section outlines done by Oct. 1, 2015, and hopefully by this time next year have at least a draft document. We might be able to reference some of the material from the NPIC document. The document won't be product or Ai specific, and needs to stay as a general guideline that shows who should you partner with and who to talk to from EPA. It won't tell you what to do, but how to get there

MOTION to accept the Structural Remediation Committee report by Grant Bishop; Second by Mike

Weyman. Board unanimously accepted report.

Termiticide Label Review Committee

Dr. Davis Daiker, Chair, reported that the committee has been relatively busy this year. Completed our line-up of the committee members and officially added Dr. Shelton with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forestry Services with a special thanks to John Scott for his signature to EPA to allow a federal employee to be on the committee. This was Dr. Shelton's first meeting with the committee and he has already proven his worth.

TLRC continues to make itself available as an ASCPRO resource out to the pesticide registrant community and EPA. Have seen an evolution in the past six months in relationships where groups that weren't working with us are now actively coming to us. Also see this on the EPA side.

Activities include meeting with one committee at the mid-year meeting to discuss revisions to a protocol. Yesterday we were able to sit down with three separate registrants and talk about anything from label revisions that really don't involve anything from the TLRC, but help to keep us abreast of changes. Met with two other registrants regarding status of EUP's and provision to status protocol. Submitted comments to EPA regarding label revisions on two products, and submitted formal comments on a study protocol to support a future label revision.

John Scott commented about meeting with EPA this year to reinvigorate the MOU discussion and to get people in the same room, and to remind everyone what the purpose of the TLRC is. Susan Jennings was the switch with Lois. Met and brought everybody back together this last year to keep good, open communications with EPA. Reminder: TLRC is not open to the public and has to keep information confidential.

MOTION to accept the Termiticide Label Review Committee report by Mike Weyman; Second by John Dalley. Board unanimously accepted report.

Termiticide Standards Committee

Mike Weyman, Chair, reported that no action items have been in front of the committee and that the last time we convened the three attendees were Julie, Brad and I. We talked about Brad's car for a while, then they left. Intend to put out an email for a conference call this fall to see if anyone has any action items that they would like the committee to look at.

Mike asked if there is relevancy in keeping this committee active since it rarely meets. This could change if EPA does issue guidelines that they have been threatening on. Mike will follow up with EPA on schedule outline for these guidelines and possibly have a meeting with them.

MOTION to accept the Termiticide Standards Committee report by Derrick Lastinger; Second by Liza Fleeson. Board unanimously accepted report.

Historian Report

Bonnie Rabe, New Mexico, reported that we have a new Library section on the website due to Doug and Derricks help. Bonnie and some of the university students were able to scan all the historical documents into electronic files. There were two large boxes with papers from 1962 through 1999. These are posted on the website in the library by year. In most cases, the historical records with meaningful and applicable information. Recently finished the 2000 through 2006 documents and will send these to Doug to post on the website. Anything from 2007 to the present are already in electronic form and Bonnie will have committee chairs and past presidents send any missing documents to her. Bonnie will follow-up by contacting everybody of interest to have the documents sent.

Bonnie offered a suggestion about having a presentation conducted at the next annual meeting during ASPCRO's 60th anniversary on all the things that ASPCRO has accomplished and how this has materialized. Felt it was important to share this information with new folks/members, especially if they wanted to become chairs and/or board members.

MOTION to accept the Historian report by Liza Flession; Second by Mike Weyman. Board unanimously accepted report.

Professional Association Report/Updates

AAPCO/POM Report

Bonnie Rabe reported that in most cases POM is directed by SIFREG with varying action items. Some things discussed at the POM meeting in September included the proposed C&T Rules, the WPS Final Rule, the Design for the Environment (label symbols) that is somewhat of a contentious topic for states because EPA changed the Design for the Environment to Safer Choice and the whole point was to relate this to safe, and yet it is still happening. This is a fundamental issue that the states and EPA need to address. ASPCRO will need to comment to EPA about this issue of concern.

We have a presentation from the 2,4-D report that materialized from the International Agency for Research on Cancer. Cannabis and hemp will be discussed at the next meeting, as well as, bio-stimulants that include fertilizers. Fertilizer companies have found compounds in plants, and in the soil, that naturally stimulate growth in various ways, but the claims are bordering on pesticidal claims, so the states have asked EPA to give them some official information. It's a little tricky and they did a presentation at AAPCO last month.

There was more talk about the pyrethroid evaluation coming up. At the last SIFREG meeting they were looking for comments and help from states. Bonnie will get an update and find out what else they might need.

Continue working on the metrics of the pollinator plan to measure if the plans are working and if they have found a decrease in the effects on pollinators. Working on putting together the POM and Environmental Quality committee's to come up with a document for combining the two matrixes' that have been created separately. This will be developed for discussion at the coming meeting, and will be shared with SIFREG and ASPCRO.

Amy Bamber, Executive Secretary of AAPCO has created a new website that is to manipulate around in. Doug and Amy will want to work together on dove-tailing different information and documents.

CTAG Report

Jack Peterson and Tim Drake were not present at meeting. No report at this time.

TPSA Report

Liza Fleeson reported that the next conference is scheduled for February 9-11, 2016 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The agenda is still under development and at this time there is nothing more to report.

NPMA Report

Bob Rosenberg, NPMA, reported that this would be his last board meeting as a representative of NPMA. He wants to thank everybody in this group for all the relationships, trust, and respect that we have for one another, as well as, all the good things we've done that have been so remarkable including the recent years with pollinators, fumigation, rodenticides and pyrethroids, it was not always like this, especially in the past. Want to thank all of you for the personal friendships that we share. I have made more friendships in this organization than anywhere else in my life.

RISE Report

Aaron Hobbs, RISE, reported that he was happy that this year's RISE annual meeting did not conflict with the ASPCRO annual meeting. The main issue of concern being worked on involves defensive preemption and what is the greatest threat to our industry and the work that you with the locals trying to take jurisdiction away from you to regulate our industry and pesticides at the local level. This is the number one threat to our industry today.

In Idaho last week I asked what class of chemistry or products were under the greatest threat from the pollinator issue. Herbicides were the number one answer. Herbicides are getting the most attention

because the pollinator health discussion has been completely set aside by people driving the anti-pesticide agenda and being less focused on pesticides and more focused on habitat.

New Business

United States Forest Service Testing Plots

Dr. Guy Shelton contacted us to let ASPCRO know that the Forest Service had sold or leased the Santa Rita Experiment Range Station back to Arizona. The plots have always been very small, but with the new chemistry's, the plots have become larger and they have ran out of space to do the testing in the existing plots. They are in the process of trying to secure another 32 acres to continue on with any new requests for testing plots for new chemistry's. The problem they ran into initially is that there is a rule that the forest service finance department cannot use federal funds for any land improvements, and its part of the Arizona's requirement for the lease of this land that they have to do an endangered species survey to fix the property for the definition of land improvement. This is in discussion with the financial department right now. ASPCRO was able to see some of the appropriation language and it looks like this may not be an issue now.

A question came up about the studies that come out of this site have very low termite pest pressure and there's a concern on whether they can bridge the data from other termite species. Do we need this information out of Arizona? Might be a question more for the western states, so John will get in touch with these states to see if they think it's important for these studies to continue, or if bridging the data with other stations that do termite research will suffice.

Proposed Certification and Training Rules

The rules came out during the PACT meeting in Philadelphia in August. John started reviewing the rules and felt they were a lot broader than he anticipated (categories, number of CEU's). ASPCRO needs to make a recommendation and comment on the docket. John Dalley agrees because North Carolina will have to make rule changes to meet this need. John figured Colorado would have to make significant rule changes as well. Comment due date unknown at time because it's not officially in the docket yet.

John asked if we need to develop a committee to provide comments to EPA. Liza thought we should put together an ad hoc group to tackle this. Mike Weyman, John Dalley and Linda Johns all volunteered. Linda asked if we were going to work with other groups, such as AAPCO and AAPSE and that AAPSE, was already working on comments. Liza thought we could create a group that is really interested in certification to develop comments on what the state issues would be. John commented that we could come back to the board after we see what EPA does with the comments to see if a committee needs to be formed. Linda commented that she had read the 279 page document and felt it was put together well. It explained the reasoning's behind their decisions and offered support for the reasoning, as well

as, good direction on how to comment.

John made the motion that we develop an ASPCRO ad hoc workgroup to develop comments on the proposed C&T rules.

ASPCRO Committee Structure

Liza Fleeson reported that at mid-year meeting in Detroit there was talk about how the committees are structured. It seems that the same folks are doing all the work and even on different committees. People on committees that are not active are not accomplishing much, if anything, and feel tied up, and not free to join other committees that are currently active. Some people would be more comfortable working on an active ad hoc group instead of committing for a larger period of time on committees.

Should ASPCRO consider thinking about the standing committee structure? People are becoming tired and burned-out, and in the evaluation from last year, there was good response on just serving on ad hoc groups for short periods of time. This is a valid concern for the board to discuss. Derrick felt it was worth exploring, but it seems overwhelming to change the structure all at once.

Annual Meeting Update

Liza commented that the 2016 annual meeting was going to be held in Santa Fe, NM, and that Bonnie would be giving an overview on the Santa Fe area during the Annual Report to the Members. ASPCRO is currently talking to states about locations for 2017 and beyond and will have more information soon. Detroit was originally considered for 2017 but ASPCRO wanted to look at other locations in Michigan besides Detroit. The Michigan Department of Agriculture withdrew their offer as a host at this time.

Open to Floor

No comments.

MOTION to adjourn Board of Directors meeting.

MOTION to accept by John Scott; Second by Liza Fleeson. Board unanimously accepted.

[Submitted 3/7/2016 by Linda Johns, Secretary]