

**Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG)
Board of Directors Meeting
December 15-16, 2004**

Meeting Summary

The CTAG Board of Directors met in Las Vegas, NV on December 15-16, 2004. The following Board members participated in the meeting: Kevin Keaney, CTAG Co-Chair; Carol Ramsay, CTAG Co-Chair; Gina Davis, CTAG Past Co-Chair; Richard Pont; Jeaneanne Gettle; Jack Peterson; Kathy Dictor; Andrew Thostenson; Dean Herzfeld,; and, Al Muench, CTAG Secretary. In addition, a newly elected member, Kerry Richards, Penn State University, was also present. Two members were not present: Monte Johnson and Lori McKinnon. Dick Herrett of the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology attended the meeting as a visitor.

More information about each board member is available at <http://pep.wsu.edu/ctag/board.html>

1. Operational Issues

Resignations – Bill Tozer, representing federal pesticide programs, resigned from the Board in early December. The Board voted to eliminate this seat on the board, but will rely on Bob McKenna of the Army Environmental Center to fill in on an as-needed basis.

Carl Martin resigned from the Board when he left the Arizona Structural Pest Control Board, leaving his seat and the positions of CTAG Vice-Chair and ASPCRO liaison vacant.

Vice-Chair – Andrew Thostenson was unanimously elected to fill the unexpired portion of Carl Martin's term as Vice-Chair. Andrew's term as Vice-Chair will run through March 31, 2006 and will be followed by a two year term as Co-Chair and then a two year term as Past Co-Chair.

ASPCRO Liaison – The Board agreed to ask ASPCRO for the names of several candidates to fill a three year term on the CTAG Board and also serve as liaison between the Board and ASPCRO.

CTAG Style Template – The Board discussed a draft Style Template which proposes a standard format for CTAG issue papers. The template will be tested by being applied to the Closed Book issue paper.

CTAG Charter – The Board discussed several minor revisions to improve the clarity and precision of the Charter, which will be posted on the CTAG website when approved.

2. Updates

Tiered Classification and WPS Integration – A number of CTAG recommendations will be considered under EPA proposed changes to the Worker Protection and Applicator Certification regulations.

Exam Administration Manual – The manual will not be printed until the new Pesticide Safety Program Cooperative Agreement is awarded.

Fumigation Management Plans (FMPs) – No contract solicitation has been made yet for the development of FMPs or a training manual.

Three FMPs should be available on the North Dakota State University Extension Service web site (NDSUPesticide.org), in both Word and PDF format, by mid-January 2005. They will be for farm operations, small-to-medium grain handling operations and large grain terminals. Three more FMPs (vertebrates, rail cars and food processing) will be added later.

C&T Template – The template is still hosted on the Washington State web site (<http://cru.cahe.wsu.edu/candt/logon.cfm>), and will remain there until EPA is able to assume that responsibility.

EPA is providing technical assistance to states experiencing difficulty in putting material into the template. In order to prepare the regions with information on providing assistance and reviewing plans, the Board suggested holding a workshop for the regions, perhaps in conjunction with the North American Pesticide Certification & Safety Education Workshop in Madison in August 2005.

Positive Identification For Exams – Board members were asked to submit written comments on the draft. One area in the draft that needs more work is how to deal with issues surrounding positive identification of individuals who have legitimate religious objections to appearing in photos. The Board discussed the implications of requiring positive identification of exam candidates, which would force states to conduct monitored exams. The draft issue paper will reflect the potential impact on states, particularly for conducting private exams.

This draft issue paper will be put into a new format using the CTAG Style Template.

Positive Identification for Restricted Use Pesticide (RUP) Purchases – In March 2003, the Board approved the issue paper on November 17, 2003 and authorized submission of the issue paper to SFIREG. The issue paper was supported by SFIREG in December 2003. Before sending the issue paper out for wider review, it will be put into new style format and get the Board's approval.

Guidance Document on Recertification Training – The board is currently working on a CTAG guidance document which will combine the need for positive identification with advice and guidance on recertification training including course content, speaker qualifications, course monitoring and determining effectiveness of training. The guidance document will incorporate the results of the CTAG survey regarding procedures used in administering training to large groups.

Process and Tracking Documents – The Board approved the document with minor revisions in steps 7 and 8. Once the changes have been made and the final version approved by the board, it will be posted on the CTAG website and stakeholders will be notified via listserves.

Core Exam, Beta Testing, and Core Manual – The Core Exam is currently being used by Ohio, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Army, and Alberta, Canada. The manual is still being edited and put into camera-ready format. The board will notify stakeholders of the status of these projects through the AAPSE and SLA listserves.

Syngenta and CropLife America have expressed interest in looking at ways that the core manual could link with their current stewardship and resistance project.

Progress on RFP to Replace CAST – The Federal Register Notice for the Pesticide Safety Program Cooperative Agreement appeared on November 10, 2004 with a response date of December 27, 2004. Requests for proposals for two other cooperative agreements (Farmworker Training and Health Care Providers) should be issued by December 27, 2004.

3. Minimum Age Issue Paper

Prior to the discussion of the minimum age issue paper, the Board conducted a general discussion of the CTAG issue paper process and general steps to obtain further support among partners and stakeholders. CTAG serves as a forum in which issues can be developed and worked on so that a wide range of people become aware of both the issue and solutions. Consequently, when an issue paper is eventually approved by CTAG, the results show broad public support and represent something on which the bulk of the partner and stakeholder community agrees. This allows EPA to cite the “public participation” process that an issue went through in CTAG. When an issue and solution emerge from CTAG, it is as a result of overwhelming support for the issue and the solution among the CTAG partners and stakeholders. Those who may remain opposed to the issue or solution are not shut out since they will still be able to participate in the regulatory process, but they face a more difficult challenge against well formulated and soundly based EPA regulatory proposals.

The board will continue to work on its public participation process to make it more inclusive, to further publicize outreach efforts, and to detail the processes that specific issues have gone through. CTAG will utilize listserve announcements and national meetings as tools in this process.

After an issue is vetted in CTAG, the EPA regions have a firmer foundation for addressing issues with states and encouraging actions by states. EPA then can more easily point to the inclusive nature of CTAG’s processes.

The board discussed the comments received on the minimum age issue paper. The few negative comments received concerned whether a minimum age should be set at the state level as opposed to the federal level.

The Board voted unanimously to adopt the minimum age issue paper. The final version will be posted on the CTAG website and a notice will be prepared for the listserves.

4. National Consistency for Certification/Recertification

The board discussed a “challenge document” on national consistency for certification/recertification. EPA will review the suggestions and give an update at the next board meeting.

5. Development of Category Exam Blueprints for SLA/CES Use

The board reviewed the proposal (first presented at the March 2004 CTAG BOD meeting) calling for CTAG to create a new workgroup or subgroup to cooperate with EPA to develop a process to create a series of exam blueprints for each federal pesticide applicator certification category and to facilitate use by all states, tribes and territories that develop pesticide applicator certification exams. Information about the new validated exam developed in Region 5 for the structural category 7a will be added to this document.

6. Status of Implementation of "21st Century" Goals

The Board reviewed the report on the status of goals listed in "Pesticide Safety for the 21st Century." The report will be revised to describe activities related to the goals and subgoals, rather than the status of each goal. The Board agreed to ask a Board member to be responsible for maintaining the status of activities toward implementation of the "21st Century" goals. Dean volunteered to assume this responsibility, with assistance from AI.

7. Pest Inspections Prior to Appropriate Pesticide Use

Former Vice-Chair Carl Martin proposed that CTAG consider the following issue: "Should CTAG develop an issue paper concerning the practice of many professional pest managers to use broad-spectrum pesticides as a preventative treatment against possible infestations when the presence of pests has not been identified?"

The Board discussed this proposal and decided that this issue was beyond CTAG's purview and is an issue more appropriately addressed by AAPCO and ASPCRO who could bring the issue to industry as a stewardship issue.

8. Global Harmonization

The board discussed a proposed CTAG work item on GHS. The overriding concern in the proposal is that EPA should ensure that adequate educational materials are prepared and distributed, and that certification exams and manuals are appropriately updated, prior to implementation of GHS. EPA assured CTAG that it will have a great deal of advanced notice of the proposals for GHS since implementation will require regulatory changes.

The board decided to table the GHS issue until the next meeting, where a status report will be presented.

9. Performance Measures Workgroup

Current Status – The "Performance Measures Subgroup" has not been formed yet. If chartered, the group would look at material from the OMB PART and other program reviews, develop tracking systems with the aim of measuring outcomes, and identify data for SLA and CES to begin capturing.

OMB PART Review – EPA discussed the OMB Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Review and distributed a handout of a briefing for EPA internal managers which Bill Diamond also presented at the December 2004 SFIREG meeting. OMB is emphasizing the

importance of pesticide poisonings and violations as key determinants for protecting human health and the environment. As a result of the review, EPA is concentrating on developing stronger outcomes and measures, which will have a direct impact on the states and the EPA Regions.

Business Plans – The board discussed a proposed CTAG issue, “Business Plans: Changing from Methods/Outputs Accountability to Outcomes Accountability.” The potential of “business plans” for use by SLAs, EPA, and CES to allow each to conduct its work for C&T and PSEP is something quite different than just a bigger, better, more transparent budgeting processing. Rather, it will require a thoughtful adaptation of private sector models using an entrepreneurial approach in re-examining the choice of goals, definition of the target of change (to achieve public value via C&T and PSEP), selecting methods, determining what success means, and the attendant accountability for each. This reconsideration will be challenging, as it pushes program managers into new ways of doing business that cannot now be seen or predicted.

The board proposed to form a small workgroup of 3 to 4 people to research and develop a C&T/PSEP proposal on how public sector business plans may be best adapted and used in C&T/PSEP. A key benefit would be to harness the entrepreneurial spirit and more creatively and broadly rethink our outcomes to better satisfy all involved. The workgroup will develop a proposal to be presented at the May 2005 CTAG Board meeting.

Performance Measures – CTAG will need to look at a combination of EPA measures, national measures and state measures. Development of performance measures will initially be top-down driven. EPA needs to have a variety of indicators that show positive movement toward whatever measures OMB decides are appropriate to gauge impact on human health and the environment.

The board heard EPA’s proposed plan to develop performance measures. A Steering Committee would be formed in EPA consisting of Jim Jones (OPP Director), Lead Region Division Director and state and tribal representatives. The Steering Committee will keep the project headed in the right direction. A Coordinating Committee, which will include pesticide program supervisors, key EPA managers and state and tribal representatives, will “ground truth” the workgroups to ensure they are not working at cross purposes. Several workgroups will be established for endangered species, worker safety, water quality, registration and re-registration, agriculture (in some form) and benefits (of having pesticides in the marketplace and of having the licensing and regulatory process in place.) The workgroups will include representatives from EPA headquarters and regions and senior level state and tribal representatives. Stakeholders will be brought in through the PPDC process. All will feed into outcomes and measures for human health and environmental protection.

There will be a two-year implementation schedule which will be driven by the OMB PART and Re-PART process. Performance measures are expected to be defined by August 2005. There will then be a two-year phase-in period during which there will be efforts to generate data necessary to determine if the performance measures and goals are being met.

Meeting OMB’s outcomes and measures is made more difficult since EPA manages only a relatively small part of the entire pesticide program. The states manage the largest portion.

10. Endangered Species - Preparation for C&T Involvement in Outreach

Endangered Species has been elevated as an OPP priority and regulatory changes will be considered. No funds have been made available to cover the cost of implementing changes to the Endangered Species regulations.

CTAG will postpone work on this issue until it can be determined if and how the Endangered Species Act will change.

11. C&T Funding Issues for SLAs and CES

In FY2005, OPP's budget includes \$1,200,000 for PSEP and \$750,000 for worker protection. Significant general reductions and agency budget cuts, including staff cuts, are expected. Because the money going to PSEP, worker protection and other grants and contracts is uncut, the remaining FY2005 discretionary funds are expected to suffer 25% to 30% reductions.

PSEP Program Review and Final Report – The final report from the 2004 Strategic Program Assessment of the PSEP is expected for the March 2005 PPDC meeting, and a discussion of the report will be put on the agenda for the May 2005 CTAG board meeting.

CTAG Efforts on Funding – Board members will develop fact sheets on non-traditional funding for SLA and CES. A presentation on this topic will be made at the 2005 North American Pesticide Certification & Safety Education Workshop in August.

12. 2006 C&T PREP Course

The Board agreed that a C&T PREP course will be timelier after EPA releases its new draft pesticide regulations. A possible C&T PREP course would be aimed at both SLAs and CES, and would cover such topics as EPA measures, impacts of implementation on SLAs and CES, program evaluation, and business plans.

13. Western Region PCO Educational Facility

Washington State has a new educational facility for applicators, inspectors and trainers, the Western Region PCO Educational Facility, which was created in response to a new requirement that wood-destroying insect inspectors be trained and certified. To handle the training requirements for a large new audience, the “hands-on” demonstration facility includes train-the-trainer courses as well as training for inspectors and applicators.

The facility is a product of close cooperation and start-up seed money from Washington State University, the Washington State Department of Agriculture, and the PCO industry. The intention is to sustain the facility with user fees.

14. Northeast PSEC

A Northeastern PSEC was created at the Penn State campus with funds from EPA headquarters, EPA Region 3, and the PA Department of Agriculture. The initial contract is for a three year period.

The first training session is scheduled for September 11-14, 2005, at the Penn State University Park. The session is designed to be very “hands-on” and the goal is to have sufficient funding to be able to send each participant home with a suitcase full of training materials which will allow the participant to conduct “hands-on” demonstrations when they arrive home. For this first session, participants will only have to cover their travel costs; all other costs will be covered by the Northeast PSEC.

The process of creating and building the PSEC will be documented so the experiences can be shared with other EPA regions.

15. Additional Issues for CTAG to Consider

Reciprocity – Reciprocity continues to be a big issue in some states. Information gathered from the use of the C&T Plan Template should assist states in formalizing reciprocity agreements with border states, because it will identify which states currently have reciprocity agreements, highlight elements which may facilitate reciprocity agreements and indicate if there is a significant lack of uniformity in agreements.

A wish list related to reciprocity agreements will be prepared for discussion at the May 2005 Board meeting. Controlling the spread of soybean rust and the mobility of applicators with large, expensive rigs that must be kept in use to be economical will be raised as issues. Part of the discussion will likely concern how CTAG might develop ideas and identify obstacles to reciprocity. Also, more and more states are concerned about their ability to pull certifications when appropriate.

NAFTA - Lynn Skillings is back at work at the Pest Management Regulatory Agency, Health Canada. Potential areas for cooperation under NAFTA are working on pesticide program performance measures and impacts, cooperation in developing an aerial exam and manual, and working on border state/province issues.

16. Hot Topic Suggestions to National Meeting Program Committee

The following topics were discussed related to the 2005 Workshop:

EPA Status on Certification and Training Outputs vs. Outcomes – This could include some examples of states that have successfully used specific models.

Developing a Business Plan – This presentation will be made by an SLA and a CES.

National/Regional Training Manual Coordination Forum – This presentation will include a discussion of the development of the Northeast PSEC and leveraging through regional activity.

New Topic: Program Evaluation – The board suggested adding program evaluation to the agenda.

Educating Farmers: Approaches that Work or Don't Work – In Missouri, Hispanics are becoming an increasingly larger percentage of private applicators. Maine is being asked to provide more exams in Spanish. This is an expanding problem area, but one which lends itself to regionalization so that each state in the region is not independently doing the same

kinds of translations and developing the same types of exams and training materials for the same target groups.

Another problem with educating farmers concerns beekeepers that use cyanides in their hives. This is not a regulated pesticide in California, but it may be in North Dakota. Beekeepers tend to use “home remedies” and they move from state to state to pollinate crops. Enforcement is a particular problem if the beekeeper does not admit that a product or device is being used as a pesticide.

Adult Education – This topic should emphasize that the lecture format may be among the worst techniques for teaching adults and that the trainer needs to shift away from being the “expert teacher” to becoming the learning facilitator.

On-Line Licensing – AZ, CA and MN are all doing some form of on-line licensing. On-line licensing through Kelly Registration Systems may have serious privacy concerns.

GHS - This session will now be shortened to an update.

Cholinesterase Monitoring - Both monitoring and monitoring failures are becoming important issues; particularly, how best to deal with failures. In West Virginia, there were often no symptoms or apparent violations with failures involving private applicators. Poor hygiene and improper use of PPE were the likely causes.

17. May 3-4, 2005 Board Meeting - Chicago

The next Board meeting will be held on May 3-4, 2005 at the Union League Club in Chicago.