

On the call: Gretchen Paluch, IA; Megan Patterson, ME; Leo Reed, OISC; Patrick Jones, NC; Liza Fleeson Trossbach, VA; Cary Giguere, VT; Gary Bahr, WA; Amy Sullivan, AAPCO

The call began at 2:03 pm eastern time.

Reed began by addressing the AAPCO Dicamba Registration letter to EPA, and wants to make sure that in the future we share similar correspondences in the future with our partners, if needed. Reed has received appreciation for the letter from impacted states. Paluch asked for more clarification on the letter process, as she has been fielding questions related to it. Jones agreed that he has had a similar experience, as has Giguere. Reed responded that the letter was modeled after the 2018 letter AAPCO sent to EPA. After multiple discussions with the seriously affected states, the survey responses, EPA, and with the ability to use the FIFRA Section 24(c) registrations to make the state use less stringent than the federal label, this was determined to be the best recommendation.

Regarding the CPDA email referencing adjuvants, Fleeson Trossbach said that unless there is an issue or a violation, it doesn't fall under AAPCO's purview. Reed had suggested that the concern be raised to the registrants for consideration in future printings. Giguere offered that while this isn't a priority at this time, it could be added this to the label improvement project list of things to consider. Patterson, Reed and Fleeson Trossbach agreed.

The NAAA letter received by AAPCO, State Lead Agencies, and EPA was discussed next. The board agreed that NAAA's PAASS program is valuable for recertification programs or to augment initial certification programs for aerial applicators. Reed will draft something for the listserve.

Reed received a request for AAPCO to provide input into a specialty crops document being put together right now. Reed is considering forwarding the request to the 33 dicamba states. Giguere suggested sending to the working committees, which Reed agreed was an excellent idea. The timeframe is tight but it will give states the opportunity to respond if possible. AAPCO will send it to the dicamba states, SFIREG and the working committees.

Reed then described the current situation at Perdue regarding travel restrictions for health and safety, and to reduce the budget expenditures overall. If Reed is able to travel, AAPCO would have to pay his travel to NASDA if the board wants, and SFIREG will pay for his SFIREG travel (generally OISC has been very generous supporting SFIREG by not requesting reimbursement). Fleeson Trossbach supports it if it benefits the association and increases the strength of relationships. Jones had considered going to NASDA this year, particularly to hear speakers, but is not sure he will be able to go due to COVID-19. Patterson thinks it is a good idea to go. Giguere definitely thinks we should go. Bahr agrees Reed should go. Sullivan discussed the financial aspect. Reed will see what happens as we get closer to the date.

AAPCO conference reviews were discussed next. As we begin planning the 2021 conference, they are valuable. Reed suggested using Survey Monkey for reviews into the future. Jones, Paluch, and others agreed. Trossbach added that she has used that approach for TPSA and ASPCRO and found it very helpful.

Reed asked that folks who are representing AAPCO in any format (committees, workgroups, board, etc.) and are engaging with EPA, to please include the President, either as a heads up or even to listen in.

Fleeson Trossbach is currently looking at three AAPCO policies as a bundle and will get suggested revisions to the board next week for comments.

The SFIREG grant is accruing funding due to the lack of travel. The Label Improvement project management training will be able to take advantage of that into the future. Patterson has been reviewing the online modules that are currently being presented in lieu of in-person training. She hasn't found anything she is particularly impressed with at this point, but she continues to explore alternatives to live training.

Reed asked for updates or concerns from the Board.

- Patterson said that she heard from the GAO regarding the designated representative. Jones said that the survey for GAO had been reviewed by the AAPCO WPS committee, and that Jones had suggested appropriate states to share it with, which did not include Maine. Giguere clarified that he had suggested Maine in the NEASDA meeting. Jones added that the committee has always said that it has been a non-issue, although NASDA and Farm Bureau had raised concerns from their perspective. Patterson then added that PPE availability is an issue. Sullivan suggested folks take a look at the NPSEC respirator flow chart that was recently put out, and sent it to the board.
- Fleeson Trossbach said that PPE into the future is a concern. She said that Virginia has looked at the respirator flow chart and they are going to share that within the state. She will also present an update of the AAPCO Technology Workgroup, and has been coordinating with Robby Personette for the PPDC.
- Jones is trying to understand within North Carolina how much PPE is needed currently. They are talking to NASS about developing a survey. There will be a pollinator issue coming from the apiary inspector association coming out of Region 4 for SFIREG. North Carolina has written a letter that is currently being worked on with South Carolina and Florida to consider misuse of products and related advertisements. An ask within the letter is for EPA to develop outreach materials about proper use of pesticides by beekeepers. It may also request that the topic be included in the upcoming EPA grant guidance. Mainly they want EPA's support. Patterson relayed that Maine's apiarist supported the effort and asked that Patterson thank Jones for the work on the topic.
- Paluch brought up the value of coordinating communication of how states are dealing with COVID 19 responses. Applicator testing issues and PPE brought up during the national calls have been worthwhile, and she is hearing that from surrounding states as

well. Relatedly, there are still questions out there, such as interpretation of label statements that pertain to an exception for applicators working under direct supervision. So, if a private applicator is using dicamba and is working under direct supervision of a commercial applicator- what are the requirements? That is an example of a question that remains unanswered. Reed responded that he will reach out to Schroeder to let her know that the states are thankful for the ongoing calls and find them useful. Paluch added that there are a couple of action items from the calls- such as alternate testing services- that would be valuable and wondered if AAPCO should be doing anything to further the efforts. Reed said that he had reviewed several. Patterson said that she had been reading some articles that raise concerns with online proctoring. It is something that comes with concerns, but may be valuable if there are no other options. Reed will reach out to Carol Black to see if she has access to a list of online proctoring services.

- Giguere brought up the 2,4-D products that are coming out for over-the-top uses in corn, and that the board may want to address it. Reed said that Indiana has had the use for two years. Soybeans are less sensitive to 2,4-D, but specialty crops are much more sensitive. Giguere is very concerned for his growers as Vermont has a lot of integrated systems. Jones shared that concern. Bahr added that there is now an isoxaflutole over the top use in soybeans as well.
- Bahr said that the full SFIREG meeting is in three weeks, and the committee is getting ready for that. The JWC meeting is planning for Sacramento, CA in September but will plan for virtual as well.

The call ended at 3:20 pm eastern time.

Respectfully submitted,

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