



Arizona Department of Agriculture

Office of Pest Management

1688 W. Adams Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 255-3664 FAX (602) 542-0466

www.azda.gov

MINUTES

The following minutes are for the meeting held on October 17, 2012 in Room 206 at 1688 West Adams Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007 (the Department of Agriculture Building)

I. 1:30 P.M.: Call to Order (Chairperson)

a) Committee Roll Call (Ms. Howarth) –

Present:

Chairperson Ken Fredrick, Carmella Ruggiero, Douglas Seemann, Robert Wagner, Jack Latham, Staff Members, and Audience/Industry Members

Absent:

Kevin Etheridge and Andrew Witcher

II. Approval of Minutes

a) August 31, 2012

MOTION:

To accept the minutes by Robert Wagner

Second by Carmella Ruggiero

VOTE:

5-0

III. OPM Updates and Reports

a) Budget (Ms. Houseworth)

1. Current Financial Report (handout)

Ms. Houseworth stated the cash flow report shows the actual numbers up through the end of September. She explained nothing had significantly changed since the budget was discussed at the last PMAC meeting. She stated the projected year end revenues, expenditures, and fund balance are pretty close to the same as what has been reported for the previous several months.

Ms. Houseworth explained the second page of her handout was the Federal Grant from the EPA which OPM receives. She stated the prior year grant period ended on September 30, 2012. She explained the expenditures through October showed expenditures under the old grant. She stated the new grant would go from October 1, 2012 through the end of next September. She indicated the new grant would be \$113,500.00. Chairperson Fredrick asked if his understanding that the agency would have over \$500,000.00 in the fund by the end of the year. Ms. Houseworth stated the fund should have an estimated \$1.5 million by the end of the year. Chairperson Fredrick

asked if that was including the funds from last fiscal year. Mr. Peterson stated it was a continuing cash balance.

Chairperson Fredrick asked if there was a possibility of reducing TARF fees before the bill went through legislature. Mr. Peterson stated the option had been discussed in a previous PMAC meeting, but by the time the process was gone through to change it the new law and rule package should be in place if accepted by the legislature. Ms. Houseworth stated over time when the TARF fee is reduced it will cause the fund balance to decrease. Chairperson Fredrick stated, for those who were unaware, the Task Force recommended the TARF fee be reduced to \$2.00 instead of \$8.00. Mr. Seemann asked if reducing the TARF fees would still allow enough revenue to cover the expenditures. Ms. Houseworth stated she has looked at the numbers and with the current fund balance the agency should be good, without fear of expenditures being more than revenue, for at least 6 years. She stated at some point she predicts the annual revenues will eventually be less than the annual expenditures.

Chairperson Fredrick asked if there was a possibility of fund sweeps coming back in the future. Mr. Peterson stated in the current economic position it was not foreseen happening, but in the event of another economic down turn anything could happen.

b) Compliance (Mr. Craig)

1. Questions on Snapshot

Mr. Craig stated if any of the committee members had questions regarding the Snapshots to feel free to ask.

Chairperson Fredrick asked how many inspectors were currently on staff. Mr. Craig stated there were currently 6 inspectors. Chairperson Fredrick asked if the number of inspectors had been consistent over the last several months. Mr. Craig stated it had been. Chairperson Fredrick asked Mr. Craig if the inspectors were able to handle the work load. Mr. Craig indicated they were.

Chairperson Fredrick asked if there were any outstanding compliance issues in the industry. Mr. Craig stated the main issues are with pretreatments and placement of pretreat tags. He indicated there is not as much of an issue in Phoenix as there are in the outlying areas. He explained the inspectors are trying to focus on the issues with the outlying areas.

a) July 2012 (handout)

b) August 2012 (handout)

c) September 2012 (handout)

2. Industry Correspondence

a) TARB Letter

Mr. Craig stated the compliance division has sent out approximately 26 letters to termite companies. He stated letters were being sent out no matter the amount of TARFs a company may owe. He indicated some companies owe for as few as 2 TARFs. He stated the compliance division will not send out a TARB letter unless the TARB was at least 60 days old. He explained TARFs are supposed to be submitted within 30 days of completing a project. He stated in some cases companies will owe on 2 TARFs for more than 6 months. He stated one company owed the agency \$10,000.00 for more than a year. He explained the letter being sent indicates if the TARFs are not paid for, the renewal of their business license could be in jeopardy.

He stated previously the licensing and accounting departments were making phone calls and would not get a response. He stated it is now in the hands of the compliance division.

Mr. Seemann asked if the letters went to the Business Licensee or the Qualifying Party(QP). Mr. Craig stated only the Business Licensee was receiving the letter because statutorily the Business Licensee was the one responsible for paying the TARF fees, not the Qualifying Party. Mr. Seemann stated the Qualifying Party would be affected by the issue if the Business Licensee chose not to pay the TARF fee. Mr. Craig stated it would affect everyone. Mr. Seemann requested a letter be sent to the Qualifying Party notifying them a letter had been sent to the Business Licensee. He explained if he was not sent a separate letter he would not know the Business Licensee received a letter. Mr. Craig stated he felt Qualifying Parties need to start communicating with the Business Licensees. He stated it has become apparent that many companies are “renting QP’s” and the QP has no idea what is going on within the company. Mr. Seemann stated sometimes it is the Business Licensee withholding information from the QP. Mr. Jack Peterson, OPM Acting Director, stated it is the Business Licensee’s responsibility. He stated the OPM has been doing a lot of “hand-holding” with the industry. He indicated he did not want to spend resources on “hand-holding”. He stated the licensees needed to be responsible in what they are doing. He stated, for this instance, he could see the agency sending an e-mail to the Qualifying Party if we have a valid e-mail address. Mr. Seemann expressed his concern if the Business Licensee receives a letter saying if they fail to pay it may put the renewal of the license in jeopardy affecting everyone. He stated he felt a carbon copy of the letter regarding the issue may get a more timely response. Ms. Ruggiero stated she also believed it is the Business Licensee, and not the QPs, responsibility. Mr. Wagner stated he agreed with Mr. Peterson. He stated he felt the QP and the Business Licensee needed to find a way to communicate and if they did the QP would find out about it one way or another. Mr. Seemann stated he wanted the ability to find out about the issue before it was “too late”. Mr. Wagner stated at that point, the QP may want to make the decision to no longer qualify that company anymore.

Mr. Wagner stated he received a TARF letter from OPM a couple weeks prior and he did call to speak with an inspector. He indicated the response he received from the inspector was not desirable. He explained he was told by an inspector they would do some research on the issue and that they would contact him, but they also stated if they did not contact him not to worry about it. He stated he never heard back from anyone. He stated he assumes an error was found, but there was no confirmation of that. He stated he felt it was an issue to not receive a response. Mr. Craig stated he felt it was an issue as well. He explained if anyone contacts a staff member and does not receive a response to contact him as he is the manager of that division.

Mr. Latham stated he felt it would be nice to be notified about the issue, but if it is not an issue that would cost him as the QP or reflect badly on him, it is strictly between the Business Licensee and the agency. He explained he doesn’t feel the need for OPM to spend the money or the time to notify the QPs about something that is not one of their responsibilities. Mr. Peterson stated he is willing to send notifications via e-mail to the QP’s, but the OPM has to have a valid e-mail address on file. He explained the agency is trying to find ways to reduce the costs of postage for outgoing mail.

Mr. Wagner asked Mr. Craig if he felt the large amounts of money owed in TARF fees, such as the \$10,000.00 he had mentioned previously, would be able to be

collected. Mr. Craig indicated many of the companies that owed large amounts of money for TARF fees had already paid. He stated the majority of the TARF fees that still needed to be collected are from companies who owe on very few TARFs.

c) Licensing (Mr. Tolton)

1. Questions on Snapshot

Mr. Tolton stated if any of the committee members had questions regarding the Snapshots to feel free to ask.

Mr. Seemann stated he felt the statistics for testing were very low. He asked if it had been looked into as to why people were scoring so low when taking the exams. Mr. Kirk Smith, with Maricopa County Vector Control, asked if the pass/fail rate was correlated with the individuals who pay to take a training exam. Mr. Tolton stated OPM currently does not track if people take classes or use study material to prepare for the exams. He explained that a exit interview had been developed and would be given to individuals who are testing as a part of the new contract with Metro Institute.

Mr. Wagner asked if there was a breakdown of the QP exam scores versus the Applicator exam scores. Mr. Tolton stated that he did not have the information readily available, but he could get those numbers if needed. Mr. Wagner stated he was just curious to hear the statistics if the majority of the individuals who were not passing exams were those going for their QP License or those going for their Applicator License. Mr. Tolton explained there were about 85% more Applicators trying to take exams than QP's. He stated there is still a small culture of individuals who take the exam "just to see what's on it". He explained at one point in time prior to their being exam fees individuals used to take the tests without studying frequently, but there are still individuals who will do it even at \$48.00 per test. He stated he couldn't give an exact number or even speculate as to how many individuals are still testing this way,

Mr. Wagner asked if there had been an increase in testing since background investigations were dropped. Mr. Tolton stated there had not been an increase.

Ms. Linda Harrington, with S.O.S. Exterminating, asked Mr. Tolton if he felt the change in the contract in not allowing individuals to take the test right after taking the class will affect the scores. Mr. Tolton indicated he believes it will impact the test scores because there are many people who take a class and test immediately after and they didn't learn the material. He feels the individuals who have been testing this way have not been learning the things they need to know.

Mr. Fredrick asked Mr. Tolton to review the changes in the contract with Metro Institute. Mr. Peterson explained there were 2 changes to the contract. He stated one change was if they provide a training class they cannot provide testing to the individuals who attended that training class on the same day, and the other change was the vendor cannot use the test questions for training purposes. Ms. Harrington stated the test fees are also increasing to \$55.00 per test as of October 24, 2012.

Mr. Seemann asked how much Metro Institute charged for its training courses. Chairperson Fredrick stated the fee for the course used to be \$125.00. Mr. Tolton stated he was unsure about the pricing for the training courses. Ms. Harrington asked if the Applicator course fee covered the Core plus one category. Mr. Tolton stated he was not sure of what the course covered. Ms. Harrington stated she believed it was the Core plus a category.

Mr. Smith stated Metro Institute is not the only institution that provides training.

Mr. Latham indicated he believed it was an added burden to the industry to not allow individuals to take a course and test the same day. He explained individuals like him, being out of the Show Low, area would have to make 2 separate trips or pay for their Licensees to stay in a hotel for testing the day after their course. Mr. Tolton stated individuals can take training courses from other vendors and still test the same day. They just cannot take training courses at Metro Institute and test the same day. Mr. Latham asked if other places provide testing. Mr. Tolton stated only Metro Institute provided testing. Mr. Latham stated his fear is Metro Institute will administer harder exams to the individuals who did not pay for their training course. He asked how something like that would be monitored. Mr. Tolton explained the exam comes from a bank of questions that has a lot more questions than the actual exam. He stated the OPM used to be a testing location. He stated the way the process works is the individual would show up for their exam and have their identity confirmed. He stated their name would be entered into the proctor site on Metro Institutes website. He indicated the website would then pull the exams they had signed up to take, and the proctor would select an exam off the list. He explained that each exam only has one selection so the proctor cannot select the questions that appear on the test. He stated the system then selects random questions from the pool of questions in the data base for the individual to answer. Mr. Peterson stated the agency also has the ability to look at each exam given.

Mr. Seemann asked what the purpose of not allowing someone to take the test the same day if they take a training class from Metro Institute. Mr. Tolton explained some feel it gives Metro Institute an unfair advantage. Mr. Seemann stated he felt it was giving Metro Institute an unfair disadvantage. He explained anywhere else you can take a class and then go to Metro and take a test the same day. Mr. Peterson explained that Metro Institute signed the contract with these changes on it. Mr. Latham stated it still seemed unfair to individuals such as him who live far from Phoenix. Mr. Tolton explained to him Phoenix is not the only testing location. He stated there are testing locations in Flagstaff, Tucson, Phoenix, Kingman, and Yuma.

Mr. Smith explained he was one of the original providers of training for individuals trying to pass their QP exams. He explained the OPM study materials provide all the proper information and training necessary to pass the exams. He stated there have been a lot of allegations that Metro Institute has been teaching people how to pass the exam.

Mr. Seemann asked how many hours the class Metro Institute provides is. Mr. Tolton stated he was not sure how long the training class was. Mr. Smith stated for the Core and one category the class started at 8AM and was done by 2:30PM. Mr. Seemann stated some states require individuals attend a class of certain duration in order to become licensed. He explained that individuals had to be dedicated in order to take a class for 2 or 3 weeks a time. He stated when coming out of the class individuals are pretty well trained and should have no issues passing an exam. Ms. Harrington stated putting in the stipulation that an individual cannot test and take the class from Metro Institute on the same day is a preventative measure. She indicated it keeps individuals from taking the course and memorizing the answers rather than actually learning the material in order to pass the exams.

a) July 2012 (handout)

b) August 2012 (handout)

c) September 2012 (handout)

2. Industry Correspondence

a) 2013 Qualifying Party and Business License Renewals

Mr. Tolton stated he wanted to remind everyone that Business License and Qualifying Party License Renewal Applications will be mailed out on October 29, 2012. He explained the Qualifying Party will receive a separate renewal from the renewal the Business receives. The renewals will be printed on white paper. He explained a link was posted on the website informing about the renewals. He urged everyone to check the address OPM has on file for them in the "My Account" system to verify that it is current to ensure the renewals are being sent to proper addresses. Mr. Wagner asked if there was a possible way for electronic notifications to be sent or give licensees the option to receive electronic notification instead. Mr. Tolton stated it had been looked at, but the current requirement is that a renewal be mailed to the licensee's last address on record. He stated that has been changed in the new package so that it may be sent by either regular mail or electronic mail. Mr. Wagner stated with other agencies, such as DOT, you are able to elect to have the agency send you renewals via email instead of regular mail.

3. Business Licenses issued during July 2012

Business Name	City	Business Licensee	Qualifying Party
THE BEE POLICE	Queen Creek	Mark Thomas Lamb	Chandler A. Pearce
NUKEM PEST CONTROL	Queen Creek	Nukem Pest Control, LLC.	Daniel Rodriguez

4. Business Licenses issued during August 2012

Business Name	City	Business Licensee	Qualifying Party
6 DEGREES OF GREEN, INC.	Phoenix	6 Degrees of Green, Inc.	Richard K. Harris
ABSOLUTE PEST SOLUTIONS	Glendale	Ryan R. Gielow	Ryan R. Gielow
AV PEST, LLC.	Apache Junction	AV Pest, LLC.	Ronald R. Vande Krol
AZBUGZ, LLC	Buckeye	AZBugz, LLC	Jeffrey J. Slingluff, Sr.
DONE RIGHT TERMITE	Phoenix	Done Right Enterprises, LLC.	Joshua A. Ferguson
JERRY'S LA PAZ PEST CONTROL	Parker	Jerry's La Paz Pest Control Co, LLC.	Jerald R. Hooper
JIM HAYNIE EXTERMINATING, LLC.	Glendale	Jim Haynie Exterminating, LLC.	James D. Haynie
ORANGUTAN HOME SERVICES, INC.	Tempe	Orangutan Home Services, Inc.	Richard J. Kirkey
PESTWORKS, LLC.	Cave Creek	PestWorks, LLC.	David G. Bethers
ROADRUNNER PUBLIC HEALTH, INC.	Albuquerque	RoadRunner Public Health, Inc.	Paul C. Sandoval
SIERRA SUN LANDSCAPING, LLC.	Tempe	Sierra Sun Landscaping, LLC.	Donald J. Wood
SUN DEVIL PEST & TERMITE CONTROL	Phoenix	Sun Devil Pest & Termite Control, LLC.	Theodore A. Lafforthun, Jr.

5. Business Licenses issued during September 2012

Business Name	City	Business Licensee	Qualifying Party
AZKID PEST CONTROL	Buckeye	Rodger W. Brandenburg	Rodger W. Brandenburg
ECO WEED CONTROL, INC.	Green Valley	Eco Weed Control, Inc.	Richard A. Hoffman
LADYBUG ECO PEST CONTROL	Phoenix	Green Dog Enterprises	Mary E. Alfaro

Business Name	City	Business Licensee	Qualifying Party
SABRA'S TERMITE & PEST CONTROL	Phoenix	CS Services, LLC.	Dennis W. Bolan, Jr. & Sabra S. Thornburg
VERMINATORS EXTERMINATORS	Phoenix	Verminators Exterminators, LLC.	Joshua P. Beadle
911PEST DEFENSE	Phoenix	Garry Lee Young	Garry L. Young
SCHNEPF, INC.	Mesa	Schnepf, Inc.	Douglas D. Schnepf

d) Activities (Mr. Peterson)

1. Listserv Signup – <http://listsrv.azda.gov/>

2. Task Force

a) Review of Today's Meeting

Mr. Peterson stated the Task Force approved the submittal of the revised statues and rules. He explained they opted for the continuation of the Pest Management Advisory Council (PMAC) and it was added to the revised language.

Mr. Peterson indicated during the Task Force meeting there was discussion on the changes to Golf Course regulation. He explained if an individual is employed by a Golf Course and is providing pest management services to the Golf Course they will be certified under the Department of Agriculture. He stated if an individual is being paid to go on a Golf Course to spray, who is not an employee of that Golf Course, they would be certified under the Office of Pest Management. Mr. Seemann asked if Continuing Education Units (CEUs) were required of Private Applicators for the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Peterson stated CEUs were required for renewal for Private Applicators. He explained they are required to obtain 6 hours for renewal which would match what an Applicator under the Office of Pest Management is required to acquire.

Mr. Peterson stated the Task Force understands there will be necessary ongoing discussion and changes regarding the package being submitted to legislature. He explained that discussion is now going to be delegated to the PMAC as the representatives of industry.

i. Review of the entire current proposed Regulatory/ Statutory Changes but of most significance:

a. Golf Courses – Moving under the Department of Agriculture

b. Groundwater Reporting – for Pest Management Professionals

Chairperson Fredrick asked if everyone understood the Groundwater Reporting and what it was for. Mr. Latham indicated he was unaware of what it was. Mr. Wagner stated he knew some information on the subject. Chairperson Fredrick explained the Groundwater Reporting is a list of active ingredients contained in pesticides determined by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). DEQ reports on how much of specific active ingredients have been used. He stated individuals licensed under the Department of Agriculture have been reporting for many years. He stated of the 81 active ingredients on the list about 3 of them have to do with structural pest control chemicals. He stated they want to know how much of the active ingredient is being used so they can better determine what chemicals are safest. He stated with better information they are better able to determine if the amount of active ingredient reported safely compares to the amount discovered in well water. He indicated it is the hope that active

ingredients that need to be reported that are used during termite final grade or post construction treatments can be reported on the TARF form. Mr. Peterson explained the active ingredients on the list need to be reported if they are soil applied. He stated if the application is directly to the soil, or the treatment requires that irrigation is performed after the chemical is applied within 72 hours it has to be reported. Mr. Peterson stated the report would be a summary on a quarterly basis. Chairperson Fredrick stated he felt it was mostly going to affect the individuals who perform weed and pre-emergent applications. He explained that more of the active ingredients listed on the DEQ Groundwater list are used in weed control.

Ms. Harrington asked if there was any minimum amount that had to be reached before reporting was necessary. She explained her concern was the spot treatments that she performs. She stated she can sometimes spot treat 7 or 8 houses a day that are under warranty, and a TARF is not required to be filed on those spot treatments. Mr. Peterson stated a TARF would not be filed on those treatments. He explained at the end of each quarter the total amount would then be reported.

Mr. Wagner asked if there was still a concern about the location the active ingredient was applied. He explained at one time there was discussion of reporting use by zip code. Mr. Peterson stated he could not recall if the reporting was going to be done by city or by zip code. Mr. Seemann stated he felt to report by zip code would be too tough. Ms. Harrington stated she agreed with Mr. Seemann, but she explained she could handle reporting by city. Mr. Seemann stated he would like to see reporting done by county.

Mr. Wagner asked if TARFs were not required for spot treatments how would the site of that treatment be recorded. Mr. Peterson stated it is specified in rule how to report by location. (rule specifies by county)

Mr. Smith asked if there were a lot of concerns with people who perform a lot of Turf treatments in city parks and on school grounds. Mr. Peterson asked if in those situations the chemical was just being applied to grass. Mr. Smith stated the chemical in those situations was being applied to grass. Mr. Peterson stated in those cases it would not be considered soil applied.

Ms. Harrington asked where she could acquire the Groundwater Protection list from. Mr. Peterson stated the list can be found on the Department of Agriculture's website under Environmental Services Division. He explained it would be under "links". (www.azda.gov/ESD/esdlinks.htm)

c. Devices – What's regulated

Mr. Seemann asked what was decided about the change in what is regulated under devices. Mr. Peterson explained the people who are engaged in the legislative process recommended that the language for regulating devices be eliminated from the law and rule package. Mr. Peterson stated that Mr. Craig explained the language for devices was added to establish which devices would not be regulated. He explained individuals have stated keeping the regulation of devices in the language will make it seem as if the Office of Pest Management is overstepping its bounds. He stated the Task Force decided to leave the language as proposed as a part of the package.

Chairperson Fredrick stated within the discussion of devices he stated his concern that part of the definition of pest management was identifying pest infestations. He explained if individuals are going to identify "birds" and put up bird spikes to eliminate the bird issue, that individual is still performing pest

management services. He stated maybe it is time to change the definition of “pest management”. Mr. Casey Cullings, Assistant Attorney General, stated Chairperson Fredrick was correct. He explained the current definition of “pest management” includes the use of devices. He stated currently the definition states that all devices are regulated unless the Office of Pest Management lists them as being exempt. He explained if an individual is using only the devices that are listed as being exempt that individual is not required to be licensed.

d. Minimum Age for Certification – 18

e. Criminal Background Investigation by Employers

f. Supervision of Unlicensed Applicators

Mr. Seemann asked for clarification on this change. Mr. Peterson stated this change states under immediate supervision an individual may only supervise 2 unlicensed applicators at one time. He explained immediate supervision only applies when performing services in Wood Destroying Organisms or highly toxic chemicals are being applied. (also applies to fumigation and aquatic services)

g. Qualifying Party

1. State Agency & Political Subdivisions – requiring a Qualifying Party

Mr. Peterson indicated there will be a 2 year exemption for Political Subdivisions. He explained there will be no regulatory action taken against Political Subdivisions for 2 years as they transition into having Qualifying Parties on staff. Mr. Peterson explained that operation is defined in session law.

2. Broadening Existing License Requirements

3. Obtaining New License Requirements

h. TARF – continuation w/ fee at \$2.00 (Mr. Peterson)

i. Business Names – OPM will only address names that are misleading (Mr. Peterson)

e) Proof of Financial Security Courtesy Notices (Mr. Peterson)

Mr. Peterson explained the Office of Pest Management has been sending out courtesy notices to companies letting them know of their expired insurance or insurance that is soon due to expire. Mr. Tolton explained the current procedure is 30 days before the insurance on file with the Office of Pest Management is due to expire a letter is generated and would be mailed to the company. He stated the letter notifies the company if their insurance expires the license is suspended. He explained 5 days after the expiration of the insurance on file, another letter is generated explaining the insurance is now expired and the business license is now suspended. He stated typically between the 30 day letter and the expired letter the insurance company provides updated insurance information to OPM. Mr. Tolton explained these letters are not a legal requirement. He indicated there had been complaints from the industry in regards to the agency “badgering” them about their insurance. He stated as of the beginning of October the agency has stopped mailing the notices and has begun emailing them. He stated the only reason a notice is mailed to the business is if a OPM does not have a valid email address for the company on file.

Mr. Tolton stated he would like to cut down on the reminder time. He explained he would like to send reminder notices to companies at 10 days before expiration of their insurance instead of 30. He stated if this change occurred a reminder email would be sent to companies 10 days prior to the expiration of their insurance. He stated if there is not a valid email address on file for the company a reminder notice would not be sent to them. He explained once the insurance expired that information would then be sent to the licensees. He indicated this would cut down on postage costs for the reminder letter. He

stated another issue is many companies receive their 30 day notice and set it aside and forget about it.

Mr. Tolton explained the Compliance Division is being copied when insurance expires and the business license becomes suspended. He explained the Compliance Division is the one making the phone calls on expired insurance.

MOTION:

To shorten the notice period from 30 days to 10 days by Douglas Seemann

Second by Jack Latham

Mr. Latham asked Mr. Tolton if the intention was to only send emails for these notifications and no snail mail at all. Mr. Tolton stated that was the intention for these notices. Ms. Ruggiero asked for confirmation that the intention was to receive a notice at 10 days instead of 30 days. Mr. Tolton stated her understanding was correct. Chairperson Fredrick stated he has always found it odd that the OPM would send notifications so far in advance to insurance expiring. He also stated he felt it was always somewhat unnecessary to receive the notice because his insurance broker will call him to renew his insurance because he does not want to lose the commission.

Ms. Harrington stated sometimes with a huge company like hers the notification does not get to the right person. She stated people need to make sure to have an updated email address on file with OPM. Mr. Tolton stated that every licensee has a "My Account" system profile where they can update their address and email address. He explained it is all real time updates, meaning as soon as it is saved on your "My Account" profile it is changed in the OPM system. Ms. Harrington stated to be careful about updating addresses because she updated her address and it changed the business address. Mr. Tolton stated it depends on what account you are logged in to. He stated to make sure you are logged in to the proper account before making changes to address and email address. Mr. Seemann asked if it was possible to post letters for any pending issues in the "My Account" system to be reviewed. He explained that way if he developed a habit of checking his "My Account" profile on a weekly basis anything he may have missed in email due to spam or junk mail filtering he can view it in the "My Account" system. Mr. Peterson stated he was not aware if the system was able to have attachments in it, but he felt it was a good idea. Mr. Tolton stated the OPM staff cannot add anything into the "My Account" system, but he stated he would talk to the IT Division to see if it would be possible to view what letters have been sent to the licensee on what dates via the "My Account" system.

VOTE:

5-0

- f) CBT Contract and Future Exam Development (Mr. Peterson)**
- g) National Core Exam and Study Materials replacing the current Core Exam and Study Materials (Mr. Peterson)**

Mr. Peterson stated there is a National Core Exam and the goal is to move toward using that exam for the Structural Pest Control industry. Mr. Seemann asked if using the National Core Exam meant the OPM would give reciprocity to other states that used the same exam. Mr. Peterson stated it would.

Mr. Peterson stated the reason it is being brought to the PMAC is because the book looks like it is for the Agriculture industry. He stated the concepts needed for both Agriculture and Structural Pest Control are in the training manual. He stated he was approached by Dr. Pfeiffer who stated he felt it was too much information. Mr. Peterson stated the Agricultural industry has been using the National Core Exam for several years and the

passing rate has been about 75%. He stated if 75% of Applicators are able to pass the exam he does not believe it is too much. He stated he feels the ability to use the exam and offer reciprocity to other states that use the same exam would be good things.

Mr. Peterson stated the change is in process and he wanted to alert the industry about the change. Mr. Wagner asked if this new manual and test would make all the old material obsolete. Mr. Peterson stated it would make all of the old Core study material obsolete. He explained that this is another issue the agency has to work through because once the last current Core manual is sold it cannot automatically switch everything over to the National Core Exam information and study materials because there will be individuals out in the industry who just bought the materials to take a different exam. He explained there would probably be an overlap period in which individuals would go test and the proctor would need to ask what study material the individual used in order to administer the proper exam. Mr. Harrington asked if it is an Agriculture industry manual as well. Mr. Peterson stated it was.

Mr. Smith stated the current Core exams reflect the local laws and rules. He asked if the laws and rules would be incorporated in the new Core exam. Mr. Peterson stated it would be incorporated.

Ms. Harrington stated she felt it would be a good change because in the current exam and materials there were things she had to teach her applicators in an incorrect way in order for them to pass the exam.

MOTION:

To adopt the National Core study materials and matching exam by Douglas Seemann

Second by Carmella Ruggerio

Mr. Latham asked when this changed was expected to take effect. Mr. Peterson stated he envisioned the change taking place before the end of the year. Mr. Latham asked if the materials were in stock to be purchased. Mr. Peterson stated the manual is available online to be viewed by anyone. Mr. Seemann asked if the website would continue to have a digital copy available for no charge. Mr. Peterson stated it would continue to be available online, but if someone wanted to purchase a hard copy from the agency they could do that as well. Ms. Harrington asked where on the Department of Agriculture site it was located. Mr. Peterson stated he would send out an email as to its location. (www.nasda.org/workerssafety/)

VOTE:

5-0

h) OPM Task Force Report (Mr. Peterson)

Mr. Wagner asked how Mr. Peterson felt about the changes coming from the Task Force and how he felt it was going to go when presented to legislature. Mr. Peterson stated the Agriculture industry has met and discussed the changes proposed by the Task Force. He explained they are in continued support of the way it is with Office of Pest Management separate but under the supervision of the Director of the Department of Agriculture. He stated they are in favor of removing the sunset for the change of supervision so it would be made permanent. He indicated it will make for an easy change when the OPM does move under the Department of Agriculture statues because then the laws and rules will just need to be renumbered. He stated he is unsure how it will go when presented to legislature, but he believes with the Agricultural industry's support and the majority of the structural industry's support that the bill stands a good chance.

i) "Your Feedback is appreciated" - comment card. (Mr. Peterson)

Mr. Peterson stated currently the Department of Agriculture staff sends out response cards to the customers asking about the quality of the service they were provided. He stated the OPM will start sending out comment cards as well. He explained one of the concerns from Mr. Craig regarding the Compliance Division was handing comment cards out with citations. Mr. Peterson explained the purpose of these cards is to improve any areas of concern. Mr. Peterson stated if an individual receives licensing they will be getting a response card from the OPM asking for feedback. Mr. Smith asked if instead of a card if individuals could be directed to an online feedback site to submit their comments. Mr. Peterson stated they are able to do it that way as well.

j) Future Changes – OPM Web Address, Mission Statement, & Agency Vision (Mr. Peterson)

Mr. Peterson stated that moving forward a goal is to change the OPM web address. He explained the agency has not been the “Structural Board” in many years. He stated the agency needed to move away from that address. He explained that change would not take place until around February or March.

Mr. Peterson stated as a part of the feedback cards the Department of Agriculture has their mission and vision statement at the top of the feedback card. He explained the mission and vision statement for the OPM is being revised because currently it is very lengthy.

Mr. Peterson stated if anyone is on the website and finds something that is an issue to let the staff members at the agency know so that it can be resolved. He stated recently he was on the website and he came across several links that were not working. He explained if anything like that is found let the staff members know so it can be removed or it can be replaced.

IV. Call to the Public (Chairperson) -

V. Communication with Advisory Committee Members (Chairperson) – Each member may disclose any communication with the Public or Industry on issues that they may want to add to a future agenda.

Mr. Latham asked Mr. Peterson if he had looked into the trapping requirements through the Department of Game and Fish. Mr. Latham stated he has been told if an animal is trapped and killed the individual trapping does not need a license, but if the animal is trapped and released back into the forest they need a trapping license. Mr. Peterson stated he had not been able to contact the individual but he would make sure it was put on the next agenda so that the information could be discussed.

Mr. Latham would like to somehow “get the word out” to the industry so that they know what the PMAC is around for.

VI. Scheduling of Future Meetings (Chairperson/Acting Director)

a) January 24, 2013

VII. Adjournment – 2:56 P.M.