



PAUL R. LEPAGE
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY
BOARD OF PESTICIDES CONTROL
28 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0028

WALTER E. WHITCOMB
COMMISSIONER

HENRY S. JENNINGS
DIRECTOR

BOARD OF PESTICIDES CONTROL

December 7, 2012

AMHI Complex, 90 Blossom Lane, Deering Building, Room 319, Augusta, Maine

MINUTES

8:30 AM

Present: Granger, Flewelling, Jemison, Morrill, Eckert, Stevenson

1. Introductions of Board and Staff

- The Board, Assistant Attorney General Randlett and staff introduced themselves.
- Staff present: Jennings, Connors, Bills, Hicks, Fish, Schlein

2. Minutes of the October 26, 2012, Board Meeting

Presentation By: Henry Jennings
Director

Action Needed: Amend and/or approve

- **Granger/Eckert: Moved and seconded approval of the minutes as written.**
- **In favor: Unanimous**

3. Overview of Likely Responses to Human Health Risks Arising from Mosquito-Borne Pathogens

At its September 7, 2012, meeting, the Board adopted an emergency amendment to Chapter 20 of its rules. The purpose of the amendment was to facilitate public-health-related mosquito-abatement programs, in the event that risks of a mosquito-borne-disease outbreak become critical. Following a staff update at the October 26, 2012, meeting, the Board requested that a representative from the Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention attend a future Board meeting to provide an overview of the state's likely response to a critical mosquito-borne-disease threat. Dr. Stephen Sears, State Epidemiologist, agreed to attend the December 7 meeting and brief the Board.

Presentation by: Dr. Stephen Sears
State Epidemiologist

Action Needed: Provide guidance to staff

- Dr. Stephen Sears began by introducing himself and giving a little of his background. He gave out two handouts covering the history of arboviral surveillance in Maine and the two viruses of concern in Maine, Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE) and West Nile Virus (WNV). He explained that mosquito-borne illnesses are “emerging” in Maine, which makes them difficult to deal with. EEE is unusual, and there haven’t been very many cases yet, but it does have a 33% mortality rate. Vermont never had a documented case before, but in 2012 they had two, and both people died. Massachusetts had seven cases, with three deaths. He referred to the data on the handouts, noting that EEE was not found in mosquito pools in Maine in 2012.
- Sears explained that these diseases are predominately carried by birds and mosquitoes. The viruses have adapted to different mosquito species. Over the course of the year, if the dynamics are correct, there will be a buildup of the disease in the bird population. A bridge vector is a species that will bite the bird and then bite a human, which is different than the species of mosquito which feeds on the birds and which are the ones which are looked for in mosquito-pool testing.
- Sears explained that EEE has been around for hundreds of years, and WNV has been around since 1999. 2003 was the worst year for WNV, with over 5,000 cases. People can die from WNV, but it does not have the same mortality rate as EEE. The risk factors are the same: older people, people who spend a lot of time outdoors, etc.
- Sears referred to the map showing EEE nationwide. There are a lot of hypotheses on why there were so many cases this year; they are trying to determine what the factors are which created the right dynamics for an outbreak.
- In Maine, mosquitoes with WNV were found in mosquito pools in early August, the earliest ever found—usually it’s late August and early September. They were found in York and Cumberland counties. The first human case of WNV ever in Maine was reported in late September; usually it’s difficult to tell where a disease is contracted but, in this case, the person never left Cumberland County. The patient is recovering, but many patients have long-term neurological deficits.
- Sears referred to the handout showing the history of arboviral surveillance in Maine. They used to test birds, but it’s easy to find positives with birds; it is more useful to test mosquitoes. Historically EEE has been in York county but, in 2009, it was found in other areas: Thorndike, Unity area; horses tested positive. Recently they started testing deer and moose blood and found many with EEE; they are hosts, but do not get sick, so they test for the antibodies. The testing has found EEE in deer and moose all the way to Aroostook County. The Maine CDC does not have the resources to test mosquitoes in those areas. Vermont has also found EEE in deer.
- Granger asked if a mosquito bites an infected deer could it spread the disease. Sears responded that deer and horses are considered dead-end hosts, but finding it in them tells us that the disease is present. EEE has been identified in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; it is considered an emerging, spreading disease. Because of limited funding they limit mosquito testing to areas where there has been an indication or history: York and Cumberland counties and the Unity area. Biologists collect and then identify the mosquito species; there are 45 species of mosquitoes in Maine, but we are only interested in a handful; these are taken to the state lab and tested for viruses. The amount of testing done is like looking for a needle in a haystack. It’s difficult to determine outbreak triggers when disease is sporadic and testing is not robust. If there is a lot of rain, there are a lot of crypts, and we may get overwintering of mosquitoes. Some people think heavy rains cause outbreaks; others think droughts are triggers because it pushes more birds and mosquitoes to the crypts that remain. Massachusetts has researched and can’t determine outbreak triggers, except that an early spring may be one, because it allows for more mosquito crops. They don’t know if there are a lot of resident birds carrying EEE over the winter or whether it comes back every year; they are going to try to look at levels in winter birds.

- Sears referred to the Arbovirus Response Plan, specifically pages 17–20, which shows a graded response. Most of the response plan comes from federal guidelines; most states are about the same. There are basically only two ways to protect people: provide personal protection education such as clothing, repellents, etc., or get rid of the mosquitoes. The question now is are we set up to respond if we have to. We don't know enough; it is probably more widespread than we have known, but our systems are not geared to finding it.
- Flewelling asked if spraying would be in areas where the people are or where the mosquitos are. Sears replied that first you have to determine if spraying works. Massachusetts has shown that adulticide spraying decreases the vectors in the area sprayed; therefore you would spray where the mosquitoes are. The more robust the surveillance, the better we will be able to respond.
- Flewelling asked, given that most towns have swampy areas and agricultural production areas, would you spray the swampy areas, and would it be effective if organic areas were skipped. Sears replied that you have to get a certain level of kill of mosquitoes. They travel ½ to 1 mile from the swampy areas, and most people get infected in areas outside of swampy areas. You need to knock down as much of the population as possible.
- Fish asked if vector species live in swamps or live in backyards. Sears replied that WNV is vectored by mosquitoes that tend to live in backyards; there are 15–17 species that will vector WNV. EEE has a smaller number of species that vector but they tend to be ones that live in swampy areas and visit backyards.
- Eckert asked how long it takes to diagnose a case, saying that the public didn't find out about the person who was infected on October 1 until October 31; she wondered if it took a long time to diagnose or a long time to report it out. Sears said they were sure within 3–4 days but that they had to have it confirmed at Fort Collins. He said that it takes seven days from the onset of the illness to a positive test.
- Eckert asked, if the state declares a public health emergency, who would take control. Sears said that at this point, the governor would have to declare an emergency and municipalities would apply to the Board for permission to respond. There should be a lot of checks and balances and the process should be collaborative. While we want to minimize risks, everyone would rather get rid of mosquitoes than have someone die. Sears said it seems that we have a system that is cumbersome to a rapid response. Hopefully, at some point, there is enough information for a rapid response. For example, in 2009, 15 horses died—that means there must be a significant amount of disease around, and perhaps that's a time when we should say we need to do something to minimize mosquitoes.
- Flewelling asked how long a spray application would be effective and how often it would be necessary to spray. Sears replied that he was probably not the most knowledgeable person about that but, looking at the data from Massachusetts, it looks like they sprayed once in the beginning of summer when they saw mosquitoes earlier and more dense than usual, and sprayed a second time in certain areas.
- Jemison asked if they had done anything to identify the location of organic farms. Jennings said they have been doing mosquito spraying for a long time and they have a series of sensitive sites they try to avoid, including organic farms and reservoirs. Sears asked what they did in Vermont (in 2012) and Jennings replied that they scrambled to map organic farms in five days. They used a small fixed-wing plane, trying to kill mosquitoes in flight.
- Granger remarked that it sounds parallel to IPM; monitor, reach threshold. However, the farmer has the equipment ready; in situations like these, with public input, it's a challenge to work quickly.
- Sears said that he would favor larviciding this year in crypts rather than waiting to adulticide next year. The difficulty is trying to make decisions based on flawed data in a short time period.
- Eckert said that in September, before there was a (human) case, the Board was concerned that its notification rule would get in the way of rapid response. She asked Sears whether he thought the Board

needed to have an emergency exemption to allow the state and/or municipalities to waive notification. She noted that the difficulty is crafting it in such a way so as to protect sensitive sites. Sears replied that the issue is really how long it takes. If it takes three to four weeks, to initiate a response, then obviously that's too long. The goal will be to get rid of mosquitoes quickly. If the Board's rules get in the way, then that's a problem. He went on to say that he supports the efforts the Board is making now. This is IPM; it's not just these two diseases—there could be something new in the future. How we respond and how we communicate are very important.

- Katy Green asked if all the states were using the same chemicals or do they have something less toxic. Jennings said that all the states seem to be using the same two products; there seems to be some consensus around the risk profiles of those two. Hicks said that there are other products registered; they are kept on the market in case resistance develops and there is a public health emergency. Other products are sometimes used in Louisiana and other places in the South where, if you don't use them, there ends up being a lot of people dying.
- Granger asked about reentry intervals in public areas. Hicks replied that there aren't any. Usually it's stay out of the area until it's dry. Mosquitoes are most effectively controlled in flight, so the products are applied in a manner that allows them to remain airborne as long as possible.
- Hicks pointed out that larviciding requires a DEP permit; there is a general permit for Bt and Bs. It puts a year delay on taking action because, in order to get a general permit, there has to be evidence of positive mosquitoes. Jemison said that there is evidence now of infected deer statewide.
- Sears said there are issues around larviciding; it's difficult to get the products into protected crypts where the mosquitoes that vector EEE breed. Larvicide work needs to be done early; but he would always prefer to do prevention.
- Hicks wondered whether there is enough data to get DEP to change its requirement. Eckert asked whether it took a full year to get a permit. Hicks replied that it probably wouldn't; if there was evidence of disease in July, a permit could probably be obtained that year; the turnaround for an individual permit is a minimum of 90 days, using the general permit is quicker than that.
- Stevenson asked how many pools are monitored in Massachusetts. Sears replied that Massachusetts spends a million dollars a year and monitors 1,800 mosquito pools. Maine spends thirty thousand and monitors 25 mosquito pools. He also pointed out that, historically, it's been important in Massachusetts; they've had a couple of children die. In Maine they are currently testing the 25 sites on a weekly basis beginning in July; this is a very small effort given the size of our geographic area. Stevenson asked if that was a comfortable number; Sears said they know where the hot spots are. He is not comfortable that we are monitoring enough in Maine.
- Stevenson stated that if the state is going to do this there should be a good monitoring program, then larviciding, then emergency (adulticiding); then we talk about organic farming and protecting water supplies. There are a lot of steps in front of an emergency that haven't been talked about.
- Jemison said he will check with a friend who is an organic farmer outside of Boston and asked how the state has dealt with his farm. Katy Green said that in Vermont, the Department of Agriculture bought GPS equipment and Department inspectors geocoded each farm.
- Eckert asked what the method of spraying would be this year if spraying became necessary. Jennings said that it could be anything depending on the circumstances. Right now the only entity with the authority is municipalities and it's questionable whether they would have the funds. If Maine gets in a situation like Vermont, aerial spraying is the most efficacious; it's important to have it in the toolbox. Hopefully, you utilize the IPM strategies as much as possible because from a public health and an environmental perspective, larviciding is preferable to adulticiding and there are no concerns about larviciding an organic farm. Right now we don't have the infrastructure and we don't have the

experience; we don't have money set aside. The state has some challenges if we reach the critical threshold.

- Jennings referred to the proposed timeline for rulemaking, pointing out that it would be good to have a rule in place by July 2013 if possible. There are questions about whether a rule would be major substantive; if there's a notification piece it might be considered major substantive. This would set the rule adoption back a year, but the Board could do emergency rulemaking at the same time if necessary. He suggested that if the Board wants to do something so that its rules don't prevent spraying they should plan to discuss concepts at the next meeting. That would allow the staff time to complete the rulemaking documents in time for a March 1 public hearing.
 - Randlett pointed out that if the Board does emergency rulemaking alongside, it would stay in effect until the Legislature acted, for up to a year.
 - Schlein said that the staff has been working with MOFGA to figure out the best way to map organic farms. Flewelling asked how many farms; Schlein said there are 32 certified organic farms in York and Cumberland counties.
 - Dave Bell asked if it was a tolerance issue for organic farms; would it be the same as for fruits and vegetables grown above ground. Hicks said that all mosquito products have tolerances but that it is a certification issue for organic farms. Bells asked what the potential for deposition would be and Jennings said that according to colleagues in Massachusetts it was not detectable. The issue is that if the farm lies in the spray target area it loses certification regardless of detection results; therefore it's prudent to exclude and buffer organic farms. Morrill suggested looking at how other states handled rulemaking. Hicks said that most states don't have an authorization rule like our Chapter 20; that's the issue for the Board. Fish pointed out that this would be true for larviciding as well as adulticiding. Eckert suggested making a variance process for municipalities, since they're the ones with the authority. Jennings pointed out that municipalities are not set up to do emergency control; if you're going to do rulemaking you don't want to rule out the possibility of the state doing aerial spraying. A variance implies that someone will need to apply for it. What we had before was an exemption: If the CDC determines a threat is present, it is ok to do spraying. But there are different types of spraying; if you're doing ground spraying it's possible to skip a house; it's more difficult with aerial spraying.
 - Stephenson asked, if organic farms are mapped, can they be skipped. Morrill said they can if they are big enough. Flewelling said he was concerned that only those with certification could opt out. Granger asked Katy Green if MOFGA was concerned about homeowners. Katy replied that she thinks anyone who doesn't want to be sprayed should be able to opt out; exempting organic farms shouldn't even be a discussion, but there should be a discussion about exempting homes. Eckert said that in a crisis situation it might be difficult to have a way for individuals to opt out.
 - Fish pointed out that we are dealing with two very different groups of mosquito vectors for WNV verses EEE; one species is really difficult to control with larvicides. Jim Dill said that the WNV mosquitoes are easier to control because they are in open water, sewers, etc.
- **Consensus was reached to add Chapter 20 rulemaking to the next meeting agenda. Jennings will research other states and bring data.**

4. Adoption of Proposed Amendments to Chapters 10, 27, and 50, and the Proposed Repeal of Chapter 21

(Note: No additional public comments may be accepted at this time.)

On August 15, 2012, a Notice of Agency Rulemaking Proposal was published in Maine's daily newspapers, opening the comment period on the proposed amendments to Chapters 10, 27, and 50, and the proposed repeal of Chapter 21. A public hearing was held on September 7, 2012, and the written comment period closed at 5:00 PM on September 28, 2012. The Board reviewed the hearing record at its October 26, 2012, meeting and instructed the staff to make adjustments to the draft amendments to Chapter 27. The Board will now review the new draft amendments to Chapter 27 and the associated rulemaking documents for all four chapters, and determine whether it wishes to adopt any/all of the proposed amendments.

Presentation by: Henry Jennings
Director

Action Needed: Decision on whether to adopt the proposed amendments/repeal

- Randlett commented that he had checked all the basis statements and identified no legal issues

Chapter 21

- **Eckert/Flewelling: Moved and seconded to adopt the repeal, the Basis Statement, the Impact on Small Business, and the Summary of Comments and Responses as written.**
- **In favor: Unanimous**

Chapter 50

- **Eckert/Stevenson: Moved and seconded to adopt the rule as amended, the Basis Statement, the Impact on Small Business, and the Summary of Comments and Responses as written.**
- **In favor: Unanimous**

Chapter 10

- **Eckert/Flewelling: Moved and seconded to adopt the rule as amended, the Basis Statement, the Impact on Small Business, and the Summary of Comments and Responses as written.**
- Jemison said he would like to suggest that Cooperative Extension personnel work toward commercial certification but, in the meantime, private certification is ok. He asked whether the Board ever wants to do something about requiring other people in the business world who make recommendations to be certified.
- Granger said that his concern was about persons making recommendations and that calling them applicators is confusing. He said people making applications need to be licensed as applicators and that those making recommendations should be licensed in some manner but do not need to be licensed as applicators. It is important that they know what they are talking about. Perhaps we could clarify that they need to have at least a core exam; maybe it is not necessary for them to have a commodity or category, but they do need to be knowledgeable in pesticide law. They need to be able to demonstrate competency and the easiest way is a license. A commercial license may not be the best fit. As far as how it affects others making recommendations, we shouldn't muddy the water by getting into that now.

- Randlett stated that it would be confusing for the Board to state in rule that government employees making recommendations are defined as commercial applicators and then exempt them in policy by saying that a private license is permissible. There could be unintended consequences in a policy that says that in some cases a private license is adequate to fulfill the requirements for a commercial applicator.
 - Jennings pointed out that it would be difficult to change the definition of private applicator in rule to say that someone who is making recommendations is a private applicator.
 - Jemison asked whether there could be a statement that government employees need to become commercial applicators but that anyone currently holding a private license is acceptable with a goal of becoming a commercial applicator within a certain time frame.
 - Randlett said that there should be a phase-in period to become certified. He pointed out that the Board has the power to define categories.
 - Fish said that most states handle it differently; they define recommendation and then have a different certification for anyone making recommendations. He felt this would be a cleaner way of doing it.
 - Granger reiterated that these people should not be defined as commercial applicators and suggested leaving the definition of commercial applicator as it was and adding a new certification requirement for people making recommendations under a separate definition.
 - Morrill said he was uncomfortable with requiring written permission to apply bug spray to kids. He suggested crossing out the words “by signing a written permission form” from section I(4)(a)(iii).
 - Fish said that minors cannot legally apply to themselves and that this is on the labels of these products.
 - Granger stated that we don’t want teachers, persons who work at parks, etc., to have to be licensed but, at the same time, they need to have to have permission. He agreed with Morrill that getting written permission is too hard, as no one is around.
 - Jennings explained that changes made to the rule have to be explained in the Basis Statement and he suggested that the Board not adopt the Chapter 10 amendments today and that the staff bring new versions to the next meeting.
- **Morrill/Granger: Moved and seconded to table.**
 - **In favor: Unanimous**

Chapter 27

- Jennings pointed out a couple of minor changes that had been made: putting in a three-tier training system; making training transferrable from one school to another; taking out the sentence about aesthetic use of pesticides; eliminating the annual notice but requiring including the same information in the school’s policy manual; and eliminating the requirement for the applicator to tell the IPM coordinator what the notification requirements are. He said all the changes from the original proposal have been explained in the Basis Statement.
- Morrill asked for clarification on if the five-day notification was now required to be sent to all unless it is an exempt application. Jennings replied that it is, but that those types of applications rarely happen; that schools tend to do applications which would require notification during vacations, thereby eliminating the need to provide notification.
- Stevenson asked for clarification about whether it is the school’s responsibility to send those notices and Jennings replied that it is.

- Eckert remarked that 10 or 12 years ago we didn't know how much was going on, but once the rule was written it discouraged the higher risk applications (that require notification) and most people think that's a good thing.
- Jennings pointed to the sample log, which the Board had requested. He noted that schools are not required to use this, but it shows how it could be done. The first page is a table about monitoring, the second page is for applications. It is designed to help IPM coordinators understand which box they're in so they know what they have to do regarding notification. We recognize that IPM coordinators are not as familiar with state rules and might find it confusing. In theory there's a lot more monitoring than applications so they are tied together with a number.
- Stevenson said he assumed training for IPM coordinators would include instructions on how to use the log.
- Tim Sorel, the IPM coordinator for MSAD 58 was in audience- and said he thought it was good, a nice quick reference. It would also be useful to show other people in the schools that this stuff is required, that he's not making it up.
 - **Eckert/Flewelling: Moved and seconded to adopt the rule as amended, the Basis Statement, the Impact on Small Business, and the Summary of Comments and Responses as written.**
 - **In favor: Unanimous**

5. Consideration of a Consent Agreement with TruGreen Lawncare of Westbrook

On June 3, 1998, the Board amended its Enforcement Protocol to authorize staff to work with the Attorney General and negotiate consent agreements in advance in matters not involving substantial threats to the environment or public health. This procedure was designed for cases where there is no dispute of material facts or law, and the violator admits to the violation and acknowledges a willingness to pay a fine and resolve the matter. This case involved the application of a pesticide without prior authorization from the property owner.

Presentation By: Raymond Connors
Manager of Compliance

Action Needed: Approve/disapprove the consent agreement negotiated by staff

- Connors summarized the details of the case. He said the complainant was a previous customer and the company kept soliciting his business, but he didn't respond. He came home one day and found a sign that an application had been made on his lawn. The company couldn't show the inspector that they had received authorization from the customer. The company had prior violations which factored into the consent agreement including violations of notification; one was a person on the registry who was not notified on two separate occasions and one involved an individual who had made a self-initiated notification request.
- Flewelling asked what is meant by insufficient notice and Connors replied that in the rule it is specified, six hours for the registry and 24 hours for self-initiated requests.
 - **Granger/Stevenson: Moved and seconded to accept the consent agreement as written.**

- Morrill asked if the company had provided proof of how they're going to prove authorization in the future. Connors said that they have a system but, in this case, the process broke down. Jennings pointed out that they are required to have some kind of verifiable authorization system but it isn't required to be written down. Connors said he would consider this a case of aggressive marketing. Paperwork showed the customer had cancelled all services except grub control; customer said that was for 2011 and this application happened in 2012. The company couldn't verify they had authorization.
- Jemison asked if the application was for Merit and an herbicide. Connors said that it was Merit and fertilizer; just grub control, and that the rate was below label rate.

- **In favor: Unanimous**

- Flewelling asked how many people are on the registry and Connors replied that there are 24, but each person on the registry supplies a list of people within 250 feet of his/her property, and Jennings noted that there is a woman in Kittery who has over 100 properties on her list.

6. Consideration of a Consent Agreement with The Lawn Dawg of Portland

On June 3, 1998, the Board amended its Enforcement Protocol to authorize staff to work with the Attorney General and negotiate consent agreements in advance in matters not involving substantial threats to the environment or public health. This procedure was designed for cases where there is no dispute of material facts or law, and the violator admits to the violation and acknowledges a willingness to pay a fine and resolve the matter. This case involved the application of a pesticide without prior authorization from the property owner and an application of pesticides within 250 feet of the property of an individual listed on the Maine Pesticide Notification Registry, without notification to that individual.

Presentation By: Raymond Connors
Manager of Compliance

Action Needed: Approve/disapprove the consent agreement negotiated by staff

- Connors summarized the details of the case, noting that this agreement combined two infractions. The first was an application to the wrong property, which was on the same street as the customer. The second was for not notifying a person on the registry. The company acknowledged both violations. They e-mailed a description of the procedures they have in place and Connors didn't feel it was a good system because the registry was not checked prior to applications; he made suggestions and they made improvements to their procedure, planning to check registry immediately upon signing a new customer.
- Eckert commented that it looks like if they're not sure of using GPS then they try to make personal contact and questioned why they weren't using the electric meter number. Morrill responded that the meter number had worked great, but when smart meters were installed the numbers changed. He said his company puts up their own personal bar codes. Schlein mentioned that GPS is not 100% accurate. Morrill said that depending on your tolerance level, you could be on the wrong side of the street. Connors noted that the company had used GPS the first time, but they misinterpreted which mailbox was the correct one.

- **Granger/Stevenson: Moved and seconded to accept the consent agreement as written.**
- **In favor: Unanimous**

7. Discussion of the Board's Homepage

The Board's staff needs to revise the Board's webpages to conform to updated standards. In addition, the staff believes it's appropriate to update and redesign the homepage. The staff will review the current homepage and navigation system and solicit Board input.

Presentation by: Paul Schlein
Public Education Specialist

Action Needed: Provide guidance to staff

- Schlein started by stating that the staff has talked about updating the home page for the last seven years. It is now being driven by the Governor's office which is planning a rebranding of the state website, which will include a new slice on every page, new state motto, and a uniform template statewide including certain designs, type sizes, colors, etc. He showed the Division of Purchases and DEP pages, noting that they are crisper, have greater functionality including tabs on the top and a left column; they incorporate photos. He then went to the GotPests? home page, noting the simplicity, with a very prominent search box right in the middle of the page, and simple graphics. He asked whether the Board thought that approach would work for the Board home page. He showed a sample of what it might look like.
- Jemison asked what the tabs would include and Schlein said currently they are "public," "dealers," "applicators," and "registrants." The staff is considering adding a tab for schools. Schlein said the staff is open to suggestions. The home page would have several ways to navigate. On the bottom, similar graphics, with categories, such as "licensing," "laws" "rules & regulations," "managing pest problems," etc.
- The left column and "quick find" could be customized for each tab.
- The deadline for the whole state to be moved onto the new template is January 2013. The BPC website is always one of the most visited of all the department sites.
- Jennings said that we're trying to make it as intuitive as possible by providing three ways to find information. Visitors figure out which category they fall into, then look at the subject they're interested in or use the search box.
- Jemison said that Cooperative Extension went from being repositories of lots of information to a blog approach. He said people get to sites via searches looking for specific information, so it should be easily accessible through search engines. He said if he Googles BPC Chapter 27 it should take him right to that rule; if someone has to go through too many pages they probably won't bother. His site is now a blog; fact sheets are kept somewhere else.
- Eckert commented that it's important not to lose the "hot topics." She asked if there could be searches within searches to help find something specific, like a form. She always said that most people won't go through more than three pages to get what they're looking for, and it would be very helpful if the search feature allowed misspellings.
- Connors thought it would be helpful to have a suggestion box; most information is disseminated out, but there's a lot of information that could come in. Schlein asked how that would work; it could be a problem to have things post directly to the site.
- Eckert suggested an interactive mapping function at some point.

- Jemison suggested an easy way for people looking for certification credits and Schlein pointed out the Credit Calendar; Morrill said he never realized that was there and suggested calling it “Need Credits?”
- It was also suggested that “Quick Links” be changed to “I want to...”

8. Other Old or New Business

- a. Other: Fish gave an overview of the Trades Show program, noting that Vince Covello would be giving two talks for the BPC and would also be available for one-on-one consultations.

9. Schedule of Future Meetings

January 25, March 1, April 12, and May 17, 2013, are tentative Board meeting dates. The Board will decide whether to change and/or add dates.

Adjustments and/or Additional Dates?

- The Board decided to change the January meeting to the 18th with the 25th as a snow date, to ensure there would be time to finalize rulemaking on Chapter 10.
- The Board added June 21 and July 26 as meeting dates.
- After a brief discussion it was decided to ask MOFGA if the Board could use their meeting room in Unity for the July meeting. Katy Green agreed to inquire about the availability of the space.

10. Adjourn

- **Granger/Morrill: Moved and seconded to adjourn at 11:59 AM.**
- **In favor: Unanimous**