## October 29, 2012 Pesticide Advisory Committee Agenda

9:30	Introductions
9:35	<ul> <li>CDPHE / CO PGP Update – John Nieland, CDPHE</li> <li>EPA NPDES work group meeting</li> <li>CDPHE PAC Appointment -</li> </ul>
10:00	<ul> <li>CDA Personnel Update</li> <li>Administrative changes <ul> <li>Mary Jo Dennis</li> <li>Elizabeth Hebbert</li> <li>Mike Rigirozzi</li> </ul> </li> <li>Multiple Inspectors <ul> <li>Dan Goldhamer – NW Colorado</li> <li>Pam King – Boulder/Estes Park</li> <li>Brian Koontz – SE Denver Douglas/Elbert Cty</li> <li>Rob Donald – N Denver/I-25 corridor</li> </ul> </li> <li>Private Applicator Inspectors <ul> <li>Gary McElroy</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
10:15	<ul> <li>C&amp;T Update – Steve Blunt, CDA; Thia Walker, CSU</li> <li>Metro Institutes computer based exam update</li> <li>Potato fumigation – subcategory consideration</li> <li>CDA – CSU Interagency Agreement FY 13</li> <li>Study Guide finalization – Exam Item Writing Committee</li> <li>General Core – updates/graphics and labels</li> <li>Soil Fumigation Manuals – training/challenge exam</li> <li>WPS</li> </ul>
10:45	CSU Updates – Thia Walker, CSU  HICAHS Grant School IPM
11:00	Pesticides Program Updates – John Scott, CDA  • DriftWatch program  • Database development  • Colorado Pollinator Workgroup /PPDC
11:30	Rule Changes for Consideration – See attached
12:00	Lunch –
12:30	Continue Rules discussion

## Rules for consideration:

- Considering: Devices that produce a pesticide product, licensure requirement.

  The Pressurized Exhaust Rodent Control (PERC) device generates carbon monoxide, pressurizes it and then the gas is pumped into rodent burrows. We had one applicator this last year that wanted to use this device to pump carbon monoxide into a building, against the 150 ft. recommended buffer, to treat bird mites or other pests associated with the particular pest infestation. Creating a Rule that requires licensure for use of devices that generate or produce a pesticide would provide the CDA the authority to ensure devices such as these are used according to the device's directions to ensure the public's safety when used.
- Considering: Clarifying Rule 2.15 and 2.16, unlicensed applicator solicitation clarification. Currently the our statutory provision makes it illegal to solicit pesticide related services without a commercial license. However, Rule 2.15 and 2.16 allow an unlicensed applicator to enter into a contract as long as there is a written provision stating they will subcontract to a licensed applicator. Obviously a company must solicit or bid their services prior to entering a contract. The Rule change will match existing language of entering into a contract, by clarifying that during the solicitation process a company must disclose in writing that they will subcontract any pesticide applications associated with the contract to a licensed commercial applicator.
- Considering: Clarifying Rule 2.13, business location.

  With more applicators using electronic devices to run their business remotely, out of state in some instances, the current definition is increasingly difficult to enforce. We've attempted to clarify this in the past, but this is exceedingly difficult. We would like to have industry input on more definitive guidelines on what constitutes a business location and incorporate those in to the Rule.
- Considering: Clarifying Rule 7.05, copies of the label and labeling in an applicators' possession.

With Endangered Species Bulletin language showing up on labels now, the Bulletins are considered "labeling". The current Rule 7.05, the way it's currently worded, does not make it clear that this "labeling" must be in the applicators' possession. More discussion is needed on whether we want the ES Bulletin in the applicators possession and if so, additional language may need to be added to Rule 7.05 to require this.

• Rule 10.02 – Structural experience requirements.

We recently identified that under the structural experience requirements for the Residential Commercial licensure category, it is worded in the Rule as "household pest control" which we of course do not have a licensure category for. Although the intent of "household pest control" reference is intended to mean the Residential Commercial Category, this discrepancy negates any requirement for experience for the Res/Com category. We need to change the language to clearly state the Res/Com category to fix this discrepancy.

• Part 8, 9 & 10: - Category descriptions.

Clarification is needed on rangeland and outdoor vertebrate category descriptions, to clarify that the rangeland category license does not cover outdoor vertebrate control pest control

## October 29, 2012 Pesticide Advisory Committee Agenda

applications. In addition we would add the category # (i.e.: 101 - Agricultural Insect Control) to all listed licensure categories.