



---

ASPCRO Annual Report to the Membership

Thursday, August 22, 2023

1:00 PM PST

*Whitney Peak Hotel in Reno, NV*

**Board Members Present:**  Ryan Okey,  Allison Cuellar,  John Pitcock,  Courtney Frazier,  Jerry Seabolt,  Christine Wicks,  Liza Fleeson Trossbach,  Grant Bishop, and  Mike Page.

Welcome and Opening Remarks by President Ryan Okey -Clemson followed by self-introductions from all of those present.

Treasurer's Report- Grant Bishop – West Virginia

- Reviewed Account Balances
- In the process of closing ASPCRO's older account and moving everything over to our new account with Chase Bank.
- The Current Balance is \$49,404.71
- Motion made to accept the Treasurers Report by John Pitcock
  - Motion Seconded by Ryan Okey

Planning Committee Report – Allison Cuellar – Texas

- Review upcoming Pest Tour options as well as other agenda items.
- 2024 Mid-Year dates are coming soon.
- 2024 Annual Conference will be held in Lexington, KY
- 2025 Annual Conference will be held in Maine.
- Looking for future host locations

2023Mid Year Minutes – John Pitcock – Kentucky

- Motion made to accept the minutes – Liza Fleeson Trossbach
  - Motion Seconded by Ryan Okey

Executive Secretary – Mike Page

- Continuing to work on the SOP's and back up data on the cloud server.
- Website is getting more traffic than it ever has in the past.
- We have 38 states that have paid their membership dues thus far this year.

## Committee Reports

### Building Code Committee Grant Bishop – West Virginia

### Inspector Training Committee – David Huber –

On 08/22/23, the Inspector Training Committee met at the Whitney Hotel, Conference Room 3, at 11:00am. The meeting was scheduled to end at 12:00pm, but the conversation lasted until approximately 12:30pm. Present at the meeting were: Dave Huber (VT), Brian Kennedy (AZ), Janine Runfalo (CO), Dave Harris (MN), and Christine Wicks (MN). Dave Huber reported the Committee's discussion to the Board.

#### 1. Cost was confusing to some Agencies.

The first part of the conversation revolved around the confusion that some state Agencies had regarding the cost of sending an inspector to the ASPCRO Inspector Training. The email sent out to members talked about a "nomination process" and apparently many members immediately thought of PREP and PIRT, both of which are training courses where all expenses are covered for the Agency. For this Inspector Training, registration was covered but not travel or lodging. Potentially, the Planning Committee can check hotels for adequate IT capabilities for a hybrid training in case states wish to have their staff trained but not incur the costs of travel and lodging. The Committee recognizes that in-person trainings are important for networking, to provide a mechanism for allowing inspectors to take part in regular policy discussions that they might not otherwise be privy to, and that this topic may have been discussed in the past, but the Committee also recognizes that more and more trainings are moving to the hybrid model.

Alternatively, the Inspector Training could be separate from the ASPCRO Annual Meeting and made into a series of presentations (1 presentation every 2 months) to ensure that staff aren't overwhelmed with trainings during their busy season and not to sit for an entire day for a full-day training. Potentially, these bi-monthly meetings could be recorded and hosted on ASPCRO's website for members to view later.

#### 2. Competition with PREP/PIRT

The Inspector Training will compete with other free training. Therefore, ASPCRO's Inspector Training needs to be marketable and perhaps made specific to structural inspectors. Maybe industry officials would be amenable to training inspectors on what best management practices are in their line of work.

For a prime example of why we need to be competitive with free training, Jay Kelley presented on a topic at the Inspector Training that he will be presenting to PREP next week. PREP will reach a wider audience and is free. We need to stay competitive.

#### 3. ASPCRO survey for inspectors

The Committee wishes to create a survey for ASPCRO members about how to get a more robust and well-rounded training that allows inspectors to say "Wow! I learned a lot and can't wait to bring this

information back to my Agency.” Perhaps our survey asks inspectors what cases they had this past year that presented a challenge and they wished they knew more about, what cases were lost that could have been won with better inspector skills, or what structural pest problems are present in their state that they want to know more about.

The Committee posed two questions to the Board upon reporting out:

1. What is the ultimate goal of the Training?
2. Is networking and in-person attendance more important than disseminating the information?

Pest Management in Schools – Allison Cuellar – Texas

Rodenticide Committee – Mathew Lopez – Colorado

- The ASPCRO Rodenticide Committee met in person at the Whitney Peak Hotel in Reno, NV on August 22, 2023.
- 29 people were in attendance
- With respect to the proposed cancellation of broadcast applications to rangeland, pastures, and lawns; and the proposed cancellation of uses in forests, vineyards, and other crop settings, when the group was asked if any of these proposed changes would affect them, there were no responses.
- With respect to the proposed designation of rodenticides as Restricted Use, the group responded as follows:
  - State agencies described the need to consider and absorb the need to accommodate many more licensees. Creating or allowing for additional opportunities for training and workshops for CECs going forward. Additional training for inspection and investigation staff, potential new RUP Dealer licenses, potential to add new information, and test questions for the licensure categories.
  - The applicator industry described the concern of training and licensure for their applicants, the costs of the products and services being transferred down to the customer, and the potential to lose some contracts. Specifically:
    - Many contracts with food production facilities are prohibitive of RUPs on those facilities. If all rodenticides are designated as RUPs, these facilities will no longer be able to be serviced as needed to ensure the integrity of our food systems.
    - The pesticide applicator industry may not be able to access/purchase RUPs in the same areas where they are currently working as there is no guarantee that the vendors will be willing to gain licensure as an RUP Dealer. Without access to the tools, the applicator business may not be able to perform work in all areas.
    - In some states, Public Health may not allow the use of RUPs in child daycare facilities. Those contracts may be in jeopardy and therefore the protection of children may be in jeopardy.

- There was a general statement that should be received as a request to consider the original intent of demonstrating experience when licensing and if the change from GUP to RUP should confer the additional experience requirements to gain licensure.
  - The product manufacturers in attendance discussed the potential effects of RUP designation in changes in distribution channels, the need for dealer licenses throughout the supply chain, the label change process for RUPs that can be difficult, and the potential of creating/causing more unlawful uses.
- As costs and difficulty to access the tools needed to protect the public health and our food systems increase, and with the stated goal of EPA to be mindful of environmental justice, the Rodenticide Committee is concerned that EPA's Rodenticide PIDs are in conflict with EPA's environmental justice goals. Meaningful access to protection from rodents may longer be affordable to underserved communities if EPA moves forward with its Rodenticide PIDs.
- There were some concerns with respect to the carcass search obligations, primarily, will a pest control operator now be liable for the presence of any animal carcass whether or not that animal would have consumed a rodenticide bait or the target of such a bait. There was some concern for the maintenance of the EPA Bulletins as part of record keeping and the EPA's vision of how this looks. Will there be a requirement to add a bulletin for each and every application, or will the maintenance of a record of the bulletin on a monthly basis suffice?
- Similarly, there was a short discussion on the proposed PPE obligations including the need to wear a respirator outdoors. The Rodenticide Committee would really appreciate an opportunity to see both the science and the evidence of an issue behind this proposal. Applicators are already hard to find and keep, and if they are faced with working under conditions of wearing a respirator in the heat, it may be harder to keep them employed.
- Finally, the Rodenticide Committee asked the group "What do want from ASCPRO and the Rodenticide Committee on these issues?" The response was more info from the EPA on the reasoning behind the PIDs and for the EPA to communicate more directly with its regulatory partners. States would appreciate learning about EPA's intent and actions from EPA, not from pesticide manufacturers.

Structural Fumigation – Derrick Lastinger – Georgia

TLRC – Ryan Okey – Clemson

Public Health – David Harris

- Motion made to accept all committee reports – Courtney Frazier
  - Motion Seconded – Allison Cuellar

AAPCO Liaison Report – Liza Fleeson Trossbach – Virginia

New Business

- IPM Collaboration Team / Rodenticide Survey – Ryan Okey
  - Looking to finalize in November of 2023
- ASPCRO PIRT Partnership – Ryan Okey
  - Requesting letter of support for NASDA to bid on being the new 5 year hosts of PIRT.
- NPMA Update – JD Darr
- Rise Update – Kristen

Motion made to Adjourn – Allison Cuellar

Motion Seconded by John Pitcock

**Next Meeting will be on September 21, 2023.**

**End of Minutes**