

Committee and Liaison Reports
AAPSE Board of Directors Meeting
Fargo, North Dakota

August 16, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AAPSE COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE
Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws	3
Committee on Committees	3
E-Services	3
Issues and Evaluations	4
Membership and Public Relations	4
Nominations and Elections	4
Non-English Language Materials for Pesticide Safety Education (NELMPSE)	4
Recognitions and Resolution	5
AAPSE LIAISON REPORTS	
AAPCO	5
Certification and Training Group (CTAG)	6
International Harmonization and Classification of Pesticides	9
The Pesticide Stewardship Alliance	9
Pesticides and National Strategies for Health Care Providers	11
Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC)	11
SFIREG	13
SFIREG Policy Operations and Management (POM)	13
SFIREG Working Committee for Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal	15

Committee: Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws

No report was submitted.

Committee: Committee on Committees

Report by: Catherine Daniels, Chair

Members: Catherine Daniels
Wayne Buhler

Committee's Purpose: Liaison between the AAPSE President and AAPSE committee chairs and liaisons to relay requests for annual reports and other business.

Summary of activities: Compiled, edited, and emailed annual reports from committee chairs and liaisons to AAPSE Executive Board members before the Board of Director's meeting in 2006.

Issues for consideration: None at this time.

Committee: E-Services

Report by: Larry Schulze, Chair

Members: Larry Schulze
Bob Bellinger
Gary Fish
Cindy Folck
Rich Pope
Carol Ramsay
Mike Weaver

Committee's Purpose: To serve as a sounding board and an advisory body to the Executive Committee of the American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE) on matters relating to the web site, ListServ, potential on-line training, and other AAPSE-sponsored electronic initiatives.

Summary of Activities: Andrew Thostenson, North Dakota State University, has made arrangements to web stream some of the NCR presentations made at the North Central Region Pesticide Education and Certification Workshop on August 14-16, 2006. AAPSE President Joanne Kick-Raack requested that a link be established on the AAPSE web site to access these presentations. Mike Weaver has created the web link to do so.

The E-Services Advisory Committee anticipates further web streaming presentations on a variety of topics which may be helpful for our membership. In the course of this activity requests for links to these presentations on the AAPSE web site may occur.

For reference: On July 28, 2006, the AAPSE Membership Committee requested input from AAPSE members on possible topics for future web streaming presentations.

Issues for consideration: The E-Services Advisory Committee anticipates future requests for AAPSE web links to video streaming presentations. An AAPSE policy may be useful to guide, accept, or reject future requests for such links to a given web streaming presentation. Issues to consider in a future policy include: the extent to which the requestor has access to other hosts; whether the AAPSE web streaming links have open (public) or restricted (AAPSE-only) access; and the definition of a legitimate request for an AAPSE-hosted web link.

The E-Services Advisory Committee Chair has requested the AAPSE Executive Board to assemble ideas about future web streaming presentation requests. The committee will use this information to determine whether a policy on this topic is needed, and if so, will formulate a draft policy for the AAPSE Board of Directors to consider for adoption.

Committee: Issues and Evaluations

No report was submitted.

Committee: Membership and Public Relations

Report by: Carol Ramsay

Summary of Activities: The membership committee has been inactive.

Committee: Nominations and Elections

No report was submitted.

Committee: Non-English Language Materials for Pesticide Safety Education
(NELMPSE)

No report was submitted.

Committee: Recognitions and Resolutions Committee

Report by: Sandra K. McDonald, Chair (CO-Ext)

Members: Dean Herzfeld (MN-Ext)
Paul Baker (AZ-Ext)
Larry Towle (DE-SLA)
Richard Pont (US EPA)
Tom Delaney (Professional Lawn Care Assoc. of America)

Committee's Purpose: to make recommendations on AAPSE award parameters to the Board; to devise a nomination and application process for awards; and to determine the decision making process used by the Committee.

Summary of Activities: The statement “This award may not be given each year” was included in the description of each award.

In order to differentiate between “Distinguished Achievement Award in Education' and 'Distinguished Achievement Award in Certification”, the word education was substituted for the word training. The committee hopes this will reduce the confusion between “education” and “certification and training.”

The phrase “two previous years” was used in the Education Media Award in place of listing the years.

The Awards guidelines have been clarified so that anyone nominating another person, or providing a letter of support for a nominee, must recuse himself or herself from discussion or votes on that nominee. This guideline covers everyone, including the awards committee, the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors.

Issues for Consideration: The Board suggested that the descriptions of “Distinguished Achievement Award in Education' and 'Distinguished Achievement Award in Certification” needed to include examples of the types of activities covered by each award. This suggestion still needs to be incorporated.

Criteria, standards and process for the “Life Member Award” still need to be developed.

Liaison to: AAPCO

No report was submitted.

Liaison to: Certification and Training Group (CTAG)

Report by: Carol Ramsay

Summary of activities:
(Operational Issues)

Expiring Terms & New Members: The terms of Jack Peterson, SLA representative and CTAG liaison to AAPCO, and Gina Davis, SLA representative, expired on March 31, 2006. Paul Liemandt fills the seat of SLA representative/AAPCO liaison and Janet Fults fills the SLA position; their terms end on 3/31/09. In additions, CTAG is adding one more SLA and CES representative to the Board. A call for nominations will be sent out in August.

(EPA Updates)

Core Manual: NASDAF, as the cooperative agreement holder, holds the manual copyright. A motion to send a letter to NASDAF, recommending that on a case-by-case basis NASDAF make an editable version of the manual available to SLAs/CES entities upon request, passed without exception. The letter will include a requirement for the SLA/CES to sign an agreement with NASDAF that stipulates that no original content can be deleted without express permission by NASDAF.

State Plan “Template”: The “State Plan Template” was renamed the Certification Plan and Report Database (CPARD) to better reflect its function.

National Aerial Exams: NASDAF, NAAA and EPA are working together to develop an aerial core exam.

Performance Measures: EPA will use the reduction in human health incidents related to pesticide exposure as a primary performance measure, as mandated by OMB. Through grant guidance, the Agency is encouraging SLAs to develop relationships with their Departments of Health in order to get better data or more data on incident reporting.

(Positive Identification Requirement for Pesticide Applicator Certification Exams)

The Board unanimously approved the document with minor edits, but noted that this paper only deals with initial certification, as well as noted the importance of the 2nd paragraph. CTAG plans to release the final issue paper in July to partners and stakeholders.

(AAPCO Emergency Reciprocity Update)

The AAPCO emergency reciprocity document contains three major categories for reciprocity: agricultural plant and animal, public health and forestry. AAPCO presented this document to NASDA and received a favorable response. The document was approved by the AAPCO board and by the entire membership at the spring meeting, then distributed via the AAPCO listserver, and will be posted to their website.

(Facilitating Conventional Reciprocity)

The Board discussed two documents: Background Information and Twelve Recommended Practices for Effectively and Efficiently Issuing Conventional Reciprocity Pesticide Certificates. Most states do not address reciprocity in their regulations. If reciprocity is allowed, it is generally handled at the policy level, although this does differ between states. NASDA is interested in facilitating or endorsing reciprocity between states and would serve as a good mechanism to encourage some consistency or standards for reciprocity. This issue could also be included in the regulatory proposal being developed by EPA.

A report will be sent to AAPCO, ASPCRO, AAPSE and TPPC highlighting CTAGs work thus far, especially on recommendation #3: Clearly indicate on certificates, on internal databases, and on public access web databases that a certificate is based upon reciprocity. No single action would be more helpful and easier to perform than this small act. It would prevent applicants from using a reciprocity certificate to jump from state to state, and it would quickly eliminate the need for a state to verify credentials.

(Content-Relevant Exam and Manual Development)

A process document discussing exam and manual development, and a document that outlines the associated challenges was disseminated and discussed by the workgroup. The Board indicated that it was impressed with the documents and suggested that an issue paper be developed to outline definitions and CTAGs vision of the standard process. The Board commented that the process document could be a tool that would allow anyone to jump into the exam/manual development process at any time. It is not a cost-prohibitive process, emphasizes flexibility and realism, provides guidance on developing defensible exams, and recognizes cost limitations across states. The document was called “approachable and practical”. The workgroup will continue its fine efforts.

(PSEP Funding)

The request for proposals (RFP) is being reviewed by EPA’s Grants Office and General Council and is expected to be published in August or September. The funding will come from the FY 2007 budget. Proposals with wider geographical coverage and letters of support from relevant states will be given preference. Funding for the first year is set at \$950,000 and subsequent funding will depend upon EPA’s discretionary budget. The Board proposed expanding the grant review panel beyond EPA personnel to include regulatory representatives, training specialists, and those who would benefit from the

training. The Board suggested including representatives from USDAs American Distance Education Consortium (ADEC). Kevin said he would explore options for broadening the review panel. The CTAG Board asked to be kept informed of developments.

(Proposed Regulatory Changes)

The Board discussed potential regulatory changes under consideration by EPA. Kevin shared the same presentation that he gave at the Western Region meeting in May and explained the inception and involvement of a PPDC Workgroup. The PPDC met the subsequent week and was asked to rank each of the 25 areas of regulatory change as high, medium or low priority. EPA will follow up with the subgroup by distributing issue papers and sponsoring teleconferences to discuss them. Those issue papers with the highest level of interest will be discussed first. These issue papers will also be posted to the docket as public documents. The Board and other stakeholders are welcome to review the documents and provide comments. Representatives from most stakeholder organizations are represented on the subgroup and should be engaging members of their respective organizations.

(Pesticide Regulators Education Program (PREP))

A Pesticide Worker Safety PREP, focused on potential regulatory changes, is scheduled to take place from September 11-14, 2006. This course will deal with both Worker Protection and Applicator Certification and Training. Background materials will be distributed to participants upon acceptance to the course in order to prepare them for active discussions. The Board's charge is to make sure that all major regulatory issues are included for discussion and to make sure that critical stakeholders are nominated by their supervisors.

(2007 North American Pesticide Applicator Certification and Safety Education Workshop)

Planning has begun for the 2007 North American Pesticide Applicator Certification and Safety Education Workshop to be held in Portland, Maine on August 21-23, 2007. Traditionally CTAG issues (exam development, etc.) have been part of the agenda, accordingly the Board considered potential agenda topics. In addition, the planning committee is considering broad organizing themes. Traditionally, travel to the Workshop has been covered for one SL and one CES member from each state. With the termination of the USDA IAG that funded PSEP, some CES might not be able to attend. Kevin has committed to exploring options for travel funds to ensure that program stakeholders have an opportunity to attend and he will report back to CTAG on EPA's determination.

(Ensuring Continued Competency)

The Board suggested developing a document similar to the Exam Administration Manual; it would contain best practices and guidance on establishing a strong recertification program. The workgroup should research other similar industries

(certified arborist, certified nursery) and compare recertification requirements. Additionally, the workgroup should develop information from states that are not as involved in selecting speakers for recertification sessions; specifically, how do they evaluate the worth of programs and/or speakers. Another concern is the teaching language used in recertification programs. With a growing Spanish-speaking applicator population, states might need to consider how much a Spanish-speaking applicator would learn from a course taught in English. The Board charged a workgroup to explore the challenges, benefits and requirements associated with recertification credits, recertification workshops and required retesting.

(Next Meeting)

The next board meeting will be held in November 15- 16, 2006 in Charleston, SC (suggested location). More information on the dates and location will be made public as they become available.

Liaison to: International Harmonization and Classification of Pesticides

No report was submitted.

Liaison to: The Pesticide Stewardship Alliance (TPSA)

Report by: Pat Hipkins, (VA-ES)

Purpose: the liaison represents AAPSEs interests to—and channels input from—TPSA. TPSA is an organization of federal, state and local governmental agencies, educational and research institutions, public organizations, private corporations, and individuals that are actively involved in different aspects of pesticide stewardship. TPSA serves as a forum to facilitate cooperation and increase the effectiveness, efficiency, and longevity of various pesticide stewardship efforts. This organization fosters stewardship throughout the pesticide product life cycle—from product manufacture and formulation through commerce, storage and use, to ultimate disposition of unwanted products and/or emptied containers.

Summary of key activities (July 2005 – June 2006):

The name of the organization was changed from the National Pesticide Stewardship Alliance (NPSA) to The Pesticide Stewardship Alliance (TPSA). This was done to reflect the fact that the organization has international members. In addition, many TPSA members are working on international projects.

Promoting and supporting container recycling and pesticide product disposal efforts in the states.

- National Pesticide Disposal Pilot Project, funded by CropLife America.
This project:
 - 1) collected basic funding, operations, and state pesticide registration fee information from all states, and
 - 2) examined the characteristics of long-running, successful programs.
 A final report, with recommendations, will be issued this summer.

- Pesticide Life Cycle Stewardship (PLCS) Initiative.
Pesticide container recycling and disposal efforts in the United States are “stalling out” for a host of reasons. To offer guidance for a more elegant and lasting solution, TPSA released a new initiative in December 2005. This initiative will form the basis for continuing discussions with stakeholder groups during 2006.

- SFIREG Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal Working Committee.
Specific issues TPSA representatives are trying to promote:
 - 1.) Maintaining container recycling programs, and
 - 2.) Changing Chapter 13 of EPA’s Label Review Manual; specifically, improving label language statements regarding container management and product disposal.

- Posting information about collection and disposal programs.
Working with Earth-911 and three states (NC, PA, WA) TPSA is developing a pilot program for posting agricultural product container recycling and unusable pesticide collection information on the Earth-911 website, which is searchable by zip code (<http://earth911.org/>). Eventually, NPSA intends to work with Earth-911 and pesticide safety educators to provide links to pesticide stewardship and safety education information.

Holding conferences to exchange ideas and technical information, facilitate stewardship issues, discuss concerns, and work together to solve problems.

Currently making plans for the 7th conference, which will be held in Reno, Nevada (February 25-28, 2007).

Continuing to update and expand the NPSA website (<http://npsalliance.org/>).

A members-only section, completed in 2006, includes these sections:

- Policies & Procedures/Guidance
- Discussion/Bulletin Board
- Membership Directory

Supporting and partnering with the Distance Education for Pesticide Environmental Stewardship (PES) Project.

PES is anticipated to be a self-assessment tool with educational modules (e.g., venue for CES credits, on-line training) as well as a pesticide information resource. Syngenta has provided seed money through the IPM Center at NC

State. PES will target a national audience, with links to regional and local information.

Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Board:

- TPSA requests AAPSEs support in expressing concern to EPA regarding the current state of the container recycling program in CA, and the potential for this situation to affect all states' programs. (Letters should be addressed to Steve Johnson, EPA Administrator. NPSAs letter to EPA is available upon request.)
- TPSA would like to continue to develop a working relationship with AAPSE, and to involve active/interested contributors in leadership roles—especially in projects dealing with outreach disseminating technical information.
- If/when the AAPSE BOD has programs or efforts that involve the common interests of the two organizations, TPSA requests that AAPSE bring them to TPSA. TPSA hopes that interaction and partnership with AAPSE will continue to advance the goals of both organizations.

Liaison to: Pesticides and National Strategies for Health Care Providers

No report was submitted.

Liaison to: Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC)

Report by: Amy Brown, University of Maryland PSEP Coordinator

Purpose: The Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) functions as the national advisory committee for U.S. EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP). Forty-three members serve on the PPDC, representing interests classified as user/grower groups, food processors, environmental/public interest groups, farm workers, animal welfare, chemical industry/trade associations, biopesticide industry, public health/nutrition, state/tribal government, academia/education/public foundation, consultants/private sector, federal agencies, and EPA lead region. PPDC meets in the fall and spring of each year.

Summary of activities since June 2005: Notes from the fall 2005 and spring 2006 meetings were sent to AAPSE members (by me) via the Listserv. Highlights of particular interest to AAPSE over the past year include the following. Please see individual reports for more complete information.

- Additional AAPSE input on the PPDC – The PPDC has added Carol Ramsay, Washington State University PSEP, to the full PPDC, starting with the June 2006 meeting (although Ramsay was traveling and unable to attend). She will serve concurrently on the committee with Amy Brown; thus, AAPSE now has two voices at this level. There are no actual seats for PPDC members from any particular organizations. Rather, each member is appointed independently to represent some broad sector. Both Ramsay and Brown officially represent the academic sector.
- EPA budget – In June, Jim Jones, Director of OPP, offered to try to draw together a broad spectrum of (a) representatives of pesticide education and training programs or their elements and (b) representatives from EPA, USDA, state lead agencies, industry, and others who have (or should have) an interest in contributing to the funding of these programs. This is NOT expected to change the direction and/or level of funding envisioned in the near future from EPA for pesticide education programs (i.e., the competitive grants program for initial certification training materials). The best we can hope for is that it might lead to a better understanding of how all parties, including state PSEPs but also trainers from other sources, as well as possible funding sources, could in future work together more efficiently.
- Proposed changes to C&T and WPS – EPA convened a group of stakeholders and other interested parties to advise the Agency on planned proposals to change C&T and WPS regulations. Carol Ramsay, Kerry Richards, and Amy Brown are all serving on the PPDC. The group has met twice, with AAPSE input provided in March 2006, following the subgroup’s first meeting in February. During the second workgroup meeting, held just prior to the full PPDC in June 2006, EPA officials advised the group they should expect to receive white papers at the beginning of July 2006 on each of the more complicated and/or contentious issues under consideration. To date, workgroup members have received no such communications.
- Spray drift – At the June meeting, a workgroup on this issue concluded that successful label compliance rests largely on good educational inputs.
- Consumer label improvements – At the June meeting, a workgroup on this subject recommended the addition or substitution of (1) baseline statements, based on product formulation and use patterns and (2) toxicity statements added incrementally to the baseline statements as needed. Both types of statements would be voluntary additions or substitutions. David Jefferson, an AAPSE member, serves on this workgroup.
- Performance measures – EPA must institute performance measures. The Agency convened a workgroup on this subject. AAPSE should keep an eye on the indicators chosen, as they may have implications for reporting educational outputs and outcomes. Amy Brown is a member of this workgroup.

Issues for consideration by the AAPSE Board of Directors:

- AAPSE should be prepared to provide rapid feedback to Ramsay, Richards, and Brown if and when white papers on proposed changes for C&T and WPS are received for comment.
- It is clear that EPA, and the PPDC in general, view pesticide education as an appropriate function of a broad sector of sources, rather than just (or even primarily) PSEPs and SLAs. AAPSE should begin now to discuss how best to serve the interests and needs of these current and potential providers of pesticide education.
- Are there any items the Board wants the liaison to bring to the attention of the next PPDC meeting in fall 2006?

Liaison to: SFIREG

No report was submitted.

Liaison to: SFIREG Pesticide Operations & Management (POM)

Report by: Jim T. Criswell

Committee's Purpose: Research and develop issues related to certification, registration, enforcement and other issues in agricultural, structural, urban and other pesticide use areas.

POM Committee Members:

Dave Scott (SLA)
Mary Ellen Setting (SLA)
Bobby Simoneaux (SLA)
Lebelle Hicks(SLA)
Steve Foss (SLA)
Tim Creger (SLA)
Jim Gray (SLA)
Chris Mason (SLA)
Samuel Jackling (SLA)
Liza Fleeson (SLA)
Sharron Stewart (SLA)
Georgia McDuffie (EPA, FEAD)
Jim Roelofs (EPA, FEAD, OPP)
Jack Neylan (EPA, ABO, OECA)

Randy Dominy (EPA 4)
Phil Gray (AAPCO)

Summary of Activities:

POM continued to address the Endangered Species Bulletin issue with their main concerns being enforceability by SLAs and understanding and usability of these bulletins by applicators.

The question of label statements remained an issue. There were three major areas of discussion. First, homeowner labeling and the understanding of what can and cannot be done by the homeowner applicator. Second, the phrase “For Use By...” where it often refers to persons certified in a specific category or as a commercial applicator. SLAs want these labels either designated as RUPs or the wording removed as most states cannot enforce such wording. In addition, EPA’s Label Revue Manual prohibits such wording. Third, discussion occurred on the ever-present poor wording of labels.

POM continues to work on the issue of electronic labels and how to achieve those so that all states, registrants and EPA are agreeable to the process.

Discussion on changes to the C&T program raised numerous questions about definitions and intent of EPA. Overall, SLAs seemed to have major concerns about proposed changes involving “under the supervision” statements and requiring all applicators to be certified. Their main concern was on how to handle testing and recordkeeping under the changed language.

Issues for Consideration:

AAPSE may wish to consider participating in the discussion of “For Use By...” statements as this does affect education efforts of both initial and recertification programming in many states.

AAPSE may wish to participate in the discussion on changes to the C&T process and the various ways it could affect AAPSE members.

During a number of the POM meetings various EPA risk assessments were discussed. In EPA’s risk assessments, EPA proposes and regulates the inclusion of risk mitigation measures. These measures often result in major label changes for pesticide products that have wide national use. AAPSE may wish to develop a mechanism to inform its members of these proposed and actual risk mitigation measures for the nationally used pesticide products.

The subject of electronic labels continues to be an issue that POM is very interested in resolving. This subject would impact AASPE, particularly as to accessibility of labels and educating applicators on how to determine whether their label version is the most current. AAPSE may wish to support, or at least keep abreast, of this issue.

Liaison to: SFIREG Working Committee for Water Quality and Pesticide Disposal

No report was submitted.
