NCR AAPSE Representative Notes

Mark Shour and Andrew Thostenson

Sorry for the lateness of the NCRPQ. With the transition to a new representative and the advent of the training season, the NCRPQ first issue in 2003 is now being published. Now that we have things fired up again, you should see this publication on a quarterly basis. Therefore, the next issue should come out in mid July so be thinking of items to share.

In recent weeks, there has been a buzz about the potential loss of PSEP funding which EPA normally provides through USDA to state Cooperative Extension Service programs. A note from AAPSE President Amy Brown covers this as well as a recent update from Monte Johnson, USDA’s PSEP point man.

Finally there are many state reports for you to digest, so enjoy this issue of the NCRPQ

Amy Brown Addresses PSEP Funding Loss

May 15, 2003

Mr. Steve L. Johnson, Assistant Administrator

During last week’s Western Region Pesticide Meetings, attendees were informed that EPA is seriously considering eliminating the 2003 pass-through funding for the Pesticide Safety Education Program through the Certification and Training Program. Future funding of the program would also be endangered. The American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE) is extremely concerned about this potential funding loss, both for the current year and the long term. Our members, drawn largely from State Extension services and State pesticide lead agencies (SLAs), are responsible for developing and implementing the great majority of pesticide safety educational materials, activities, and programming for applicators throughout the United States. Loss of funding would have serious impacts on both the quality and quantity of training in the U.S., at a time when leadership from EPA, states, and Extension have all been working toward higher minimum standards. Potential impacts include the following:

* Change in agency responsible for pesticide applicator training. In some states, all training would revert to the SLA; in others, it would be bounced back to EPA. In any case, neither EPA nor SLAs will receive any monies that have been going to state Extension for support of PSEP, since these monies will no longer be in the budget. Many SLAs are already under budget constraints resulting in a shortfall of both funding and staff to implement their current programs and will not have the resources or capabilities to take over this part of the C&T. Clearly, the cut would have a number of effects on those SLAs who would accept responsibility for the program if Extension in their state is forced to default. These impacts include increased workloads and a decreased ability to get information out to applicators, as many SLAs use Extension as their outreach. In many states, new contacts would need to be made and a new structure designed to implement the program if the Extension field agents are no longer to be involved in providing training. It would take years to rebuild.

* Reduction in programs maintained by Extension services. In states that would elect to maintain the program within Extension, virtually all would see a drastic reduction in quantity and quality of service, as outlined separately below. This money has provided a focal point to the program and provided a contact and someone dedicated to seeing that there is an active program. Without these funds, emphasis on quality pesticide safety training may be lost.

* Loss of personnel who develop and provide training programs and materials. If funds are lost even for one year, some states would have to let personnel go. These experts develop new training materials, organize and teach certification and recertification classes, and train other trainers in their states. They attend professional development courses and provide expertise to other trainers in the state that cannot be easily reproduced or sought elsewhere.

* Reduction in quality of education for applicators. Current regulations will not be affected, but the education and outreach to support them and ensure proper implementation will no longer exist. Extension’s capacity to train applicators on pesti-
cide safety, to educate them regarding their obligations under the various pesticide-related regulations, and to assist in risk reduction and security concerns associated with use of pesticides, will be severely impaired. Even where pesticide applicator organizations do some or a lot of their own training programs, Extension speakers have often been a mainstay in these programs, as they have the expertise required to teach the subject matter. Extension personnel have a background in educational methods and development, and especially adult education, that regulatory and private industry representatives often lack.

* More reliance on training by private industry. While many State pesticide safety education programs incorporate speakers from industry into Extension-sponsored training sessions, there would be reluctance to move to increased dependence on this source.

* Loss of opportunities for contact and compliance. The rapport that Extension has with applicators, especially private applicators, cannot be duplicated by the SLA. Some SLA members have pointed out that no matter how good the working relationship is between the SLA and applicators, especially growers, the SLA's are still regulatory and viewed as such by the industry. In contrast, Extension provides the opportunity to work with applicators, especially on site, to assist them in improving their operations. Applicators turn to Extension for compliance assistance without fear of regulatory repercussions, which tends to improve the likelihood of cooperation.

* Reduction in training opportunities. Particularly in large states, a lack of funds for travel support would result in a reduction in hands-on training. PSEP funds in many states are currently used to support travel to training meetings not only for the PSEP Coordinators and Extension agents, but also to bring in experts from the state and around the country. While self-study materials are a component of most pesticide safety education programs, they are generally not considered an adequate replacement for in-person training.

* Reduction in standards at the state level. One way to deal with a reduced budget is to reduce the requirements applicators would need to meet. Some states have responded that they would be forced to pass changes in state regulations to increase the time period between recertification cycles, thus decreasing the amount of training applicators would need to accumulate over time.

* Loss of ability to remain current and on-target. Extension Pesticide Educators produce most of the materials used to train pesticide applicators (and consumers). With a loss of funding, new training materials could not be produced, and consequently, new topics of concern regarding risk reduction to both humans and the environment would not be introduced to the training programs. Materials produced at the federal level would not be adapted or revised for regional or state conditions, compromising their usefulness.

* More (and higher) pay-for-use services. States that elect to keep running the programs—whether through Extension or the SLA—will be forced to make the programs pay for themselves. Even so, a base program and staff are essential in order to establish and maintain a fee supported. In states and/or categories with small numbers of applicators, higher fees could deter applicators from meeting certification and recertification requirements. The net effect would be to cause people to be unable to stay in business legitimately, or to operate without the necessary certification, adding to the burden on the regulators.

* Increased misunderstanding of regulatory requirements. Although the SLAs are responsible for regulating pesticides in their states, Extension personnel are often involved in educating applicators about new requirements, changes in policy, etc. The Extension PSEP Coordinator is often responsible for training field agents, distributing newsletters, and making personal contacts with pesticide applicators so that they understand their responsibilities as regulations and policies change.

* Increased incidence of misuse of pesticides. An effective education program is an essential component of pesticide enforcement issues. Any loss in Extension's continued training and education may also have the effect of causing more misuse (even if unintentional) of pesticides.

* Threats to homeland security. If applicators, dealers, and distributors are not trained properly, restricted use pesticides may become more easily available to noncertified individuals. AAPSE documented last year how good outreach PSEP programs have traditionally provided security information and training to certified applicators and other pesticide users.
* Loss of Extension expertise in program improvement efforts. Extension involvement in national-level assessments to improve certification and training programs for workers, handlers, certified applicators and health care providers would cease. Over the last few years, national leaders from EPA, states, Extension, and industry have been working together to develop recommendations and practices to upgrade the minimum standards, with the goal being improved protection of environmental and human health. If PSEP funding is discontinued, Extension expertise in the planning stages will be lost, along with the current best mechanism of implementation for recommended changes.

* Loss of additional matching funds. All states provide additional funds for PSEP, either in real dollars or in-kind services. These funds extend the programs beyond traditional training for private and commercial applicators to registered employees or technicians, consumers, and the health care community. The ability to obtain matching funds will be jeopardized if the underlying support from the federal source (EPA) is lost.

* Loss of program continuity. Even if funding is lost only for one year, (2003), some states will face cuts in personnel. This will cause disruption to the program and may affect the ability of the state to offer the same high quality pesticide education program as in the past.

AAPSE supports EPA in finding the best way to fund PSEP, whether through a continued pass-through mechanism with USDA based on improved accounting practices, or through instituting a new system of Interagency Agreements with the State Cooperative Extension units. In either case, funding of this important program should be safeguarded to ensure the best risk minimization education of those who apply pesticides. Regulatory efforts are important, but without education and outreach, we will be following up on misuses rather than ensuring minimization of exposure of humans and the environment. AAPSE wants to ensure that the high quality programs developed and implemented by Cooperative Extension to support and extend efforts by EPA and state regulatory programs be continued without interruption.

Thank you for your consideration of this urgent matter.

Sincerely, Amy E. Brown, President, AAPSE
and will let you know immediately when we receive a written final decision.

**Certification & Training Assessment Group Update—Al Muench**

The Certification & Training Assessment Group (CTAG) is a consortium of professionals to promote the safe and effective use of pesticides through education, testing and licensing, and enforcement. CTAG is managed by a board of directors that draws its membership from representatives of EPA, USDA, SLA, CES, AFPMB and TPPC. Three workgroups have been formed to focus activities on specific projects.

**CTAG Presentations**

CTAG board of directors co-chairs Kevin Keaney and Gina Davis made numerous presentations to AAPCO and SFIREG to provide updates on CTAG activities and to discuss progress on CTAG projects. Additional presentations were made by CTAG board of directors to the Western Regional Pesticide Meeting, North Central Pesticide Meeting, Northeast regional Pesticide Meeting, and the Canadian Workgroup on Pesticide Education, Certification, and Training.

**PREP Course**

Each year EPA sponsors several Pesticide Regulatory Education Program (PREP) training courses for officials in state pesticide regulatory programs. The first PREP course in the 2002 series was a pesticide applicator certification program workshop presented by CTAG and held at the University of California, Davis on April 28 - May 1, 2002.

One session was devoted to developing an electronic reporting format for completing the state C&T plans and annual reports which are required by 40 CFR 171.7. The second session concentrated on brainstorming priority issues that will facilitate providing EPA with a proposed plan for a comprehensive pesticide safety program.

CTAG received in-depth, high-quality feedback on the work presented. In addition, the range of pesticide talent working on these issues continued to expand as many of the PREP course participants volunteered to continue working on one or more of these issues. Several participating states volunteered to pre-test the electronic reporting template.

---

**CTAG Workgroup on C&T Plans**

The State Plan Workgroup used input from participants in the 2002 C&T PREP course to develop a uniform national electronic template for C&T plans that meet the requirements of FIFRA. The workgroup plans to make the Web-based template available for use by all of the states and territories by the National C&T Workshop in August 2003.

This workgroup also developed three white papers to address potential changes in FIFRA and grant guidance that make improvements to the C&T process:

- The first white paper proposes a change in FIFRA to replace the current 50/50 funding match requirement that exists for C&T programs under the FIFRA pesticide cooperative agreement grant program with the 85/15 funding match requirement used in other FIFRA programs.
- The second white paper seeks to improve professionalism of certified applicators by requiring all states to use monitored, written, closed-book examinations for certification of both private and commercial pesticide applicators.
- The third white paper recommends that EPA implement a minimum-age restriction of 16 (with possible exemptions for hardship cases) for certification/licensing as a requirement for approval of a state plan for the certification of private and commercial pesticide applicators.

Each of these white papers has been presented to AAPCO and SFIREG. The first two issue papers will be presented to the full SFIREG in June 2003. The third white paper has been accepted by the full SFIREG and submitted to EPA for further action.

---

**CTAG Workgroup on Pesticide Safety**

The mission of the Pesticide Safety Workgroup is to provide EPA with a new plan for a comprehensive pesticide safety program, for all persons who sell, mix, load, apply, or recommend the use of pesticides, that will demonstrate competency, mitigate risk, and improve pesticide security through appropriate education, training, and competency testing. The new plan will implement the CTAG goal to incorporate into the C&T program the certification and training requirements for WPS handlers, crop consultants, and aerial applicators. This will remove from the WPS program, and place into the C&T program, those who use or recommend the use of pesticides so that the remaining WPS program can be more tightly focused on the agricultural workers who do not handle pesticides. As a result, this will put into one place all of the national pesticide C&T regulations and serve to give pesticide handlers a well-defined career path toward becoming a certified applicator.

This workgroup has several subgroups actively working...
on the following issues:

- **WPS Integration Subgroup** is charged to develop an outline of the steps necessary to implement the pesticide handler training requirements of the Worker Protection Standard into the C&T program.
- **Positive Identification Subgroup** is charged to identify issues and concerns with positive identification of individuals sitting for exams and seeking certification, sitting for recertification training or exams, or individuals who seek to purchase pesticides.
- **Subgroup to Improve the Skills of Trainers/Educators** is charged to identify alternative methods to improve the skills of pesticide safety trainers and educators.
- **Subgroup on Testing Issues** is charged to examine advantages, disadvantages and economics of remote testing, and to improve exam security.

**CTAG Workgroup on Tiered Classification**
The Tiered Classification Workgroup is charged to develop a proposal for a pesticide product classification system which: tiers the type of user, including occupational and non-occupational users; product characteristics, including an assessment of homeland security risk and level of human or environmental toxicity or hazard; the level of pesticide education and safety training appropriate or required; certification or licensing requirements; application site characteristics; and engineering or manufacturing controls. This workgroup has produced a number of draft issue papers that are being reviewed by the CTAG board of directors.

**Homeland Security Issues**
CTAG is working with EPA to help strengthen the pesticide program and improve pesticide security. CTAG feels that properly qualified and well-trained pesticide applicators, dealers, and consultants are the first line of homeland defense against the accidental or deliberate misuse of pesticides including their potential use as chemical terrorism agents.

For more CTAG information, refer to the CTAG web page http://pep.wsu.edu/ctag

**2003 National Certification and Training Workshop**
The National Certification and Training (C&T) Workshop, sponsored by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, will be held at the Ala Moana Hotel in Honolulu, Hawaii on August 11-14, 2003. This workshop will be co-hosted by the University of Hawaii Cooperative Extension and the Hawaii Department of Agriculture.

The national workshop is an opportunity to network with specialists from the United States, Canada, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Rim. Discussions and presentations will include proposals for global/US harmonization of pesticide applicator C&T, current needs/trends/successes of the C&T program and its clientele, and new tools/techniques which can assist you in your certification and training programs.

Hotel information, workshop registration information, and a tentative agenda are available on-line at http://www.pested.psu.edu/nationalepameeting/index.shtml

An optional agricultural tour on August 11 will include potted ornamentals, high-end agriculture, edible seaweed, tropical fish, pineapples, and an Agricultural Experiment Station.

General sessions will occur August 12-14. Topics will include EPA updates on worker protection and C&T; updates from Canada, Mexico and other countries; PowerPoint, streaming video and DVD for applicator training; adult learning principles; making the case to move to computer-based testing; demographic shift in C&T clientele; strengths and weaknesses for delivering distance education; national Agricultural Health Study findings; Canada Healthy Lawns strategy; national core exam/core manual; and Canadian proposal for pesticide classification and C&T.

Breakout sessions on August 13 will center on the Certification and Training Assessment Group. Topics include: structure, goals, projects, and successes for the pesticide safety for the 21st century; state plan and reporting template; proposal for a written exam and age requirement positive ID and test security; and WPS handler integration into the C&T program.

Breakout sessions on August 14 will include U.S. Department of Defense pesticide programs; breast cancer & environmental chemistry: why is there concern; partnering with industry in training development; farm family exposure; major certification trends; and C&T program accountability and budgeting.

Two other meetings are being held in conjunction with the National C&T Workshop. The AAPSE board of di-
rectors will meet August 10, with a general business meeting on August 14. The CTAG board of directors will meet August 15 and 16.

**Missouri to Host 2004 NCR Pesticide Education and Certification Workshop**

St. Louis will be the host city for the 2004 North Central Region Pesticide Education and Certification Workshop. The workshop will be held at the Radisson Hotel and Suites in downtown St. Louis June 6 – 9. The Radisson boasts a terrific location with the Gateway Arch, Busch Stadium, fabulous shops, and world-class restaurants at its doorstep. Fred Fishel and Paul Bailey look forward to hosting this important event for pesticide safety educators. Anyone interested in serving on the program committee should contact either Fred Fishel at the University of Missouri (573-884-6361; fishelf@missouri.edu) or Paul Bailey at the Missouri Department of Agriculture (573-751-5510; Paul_Bailey@mail.mda.state.mo.us).

**Indiana—Carl Rew**

Region 5 States Conducting Test Validation Effort For Residential, Institutional And Health-Related Pest Control Category

Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin are participating in a test validation effort for the residential, institutional, and health-related pest control category of the national certification exam. A 25-member expert committee was selected and they have met two times already. The expert committee consists of the certification manager, the extension leader, and three pest control operators from each state.

A survey was conducted in the participating states of 2,000 licensed applicators. The survey response was great. 658 (33%) of the 2,000 surveys mailed were completed and returned. Many people surveyed wrote positive comments and returned them with their completed survey. A job analysis and a test blueprint have been developed thus far and the committee will meet at least one more time to write items and establish a cut score.

This project began in September 2002. A grant from EPA Region 5 was awarded to fund the traveling and the survey. The primary goal of the project is to develop a certification exam with common subject matter items from among the EPA Region 5 states. The participating states have been able to identify the similarities and differences between their own state certification and testing programs and the other states programs. When completed, this project should promote regional reciprocity and cooperation in the consolidation of certification exams and training materials. The participants are gaining invaluable experience in handling the issues encountered when validating certification exams.

**Nebraska PSEP**

We have had great success in our survey instrument to assess the impact of Pesticide Safety Education Programs among applicators. It has been used to collect input from Nebraska private applicators and to evaluate specific educational components of the private applicator program. WordPerfect is the format of the instrument; this makes it pleasant to use based on the structure, ease, and flexibility. A copy of the survey is attached to this newsletter and is available for adaptation and use by PSEP colleagues. Please let us know how you have adapted it for your use.

The instrument is updated each year to reflect a specific year’s program and content. A similar survey instrument structure is used to collect input from commercial and non-commercial pesticide applicators.

The survey instrument lends itself to an easily calculated, average numerical value for each question or entry. Respondents are asked to answer each question by selecting 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, where 1 = poor and 5 = superior.

The survey also allows the application of percentages to each of the question options in any survey summary. For example, private applicators evaluated the UNL Certification Study Guide (a handout) and their responses on the quality of this publication were 16% superior, 64% excellent, 19% good, 1% fair, and 0% poor.

As an example in measuring impact of our PSEP, we provided an educational segment in the program on the effectiveness of glyphosate as influenced by the time of day for application. On the survey, private applicators were then asked, "As a result of this session, I will consider the time of day for a glyphosate application for best weed control?" Responses were 79% always, 21% sometimes, and 0% never.

A hard copy of the survey instrument is distributed each year in our PSEP in-service manual to Extension Educa-
tors. It is also provided electronically to Educators upon request. Educators make hard copies locally, distribute the surveys to applicators at their educational sessions, and then forward all completed surveys to our office for tabulation.

WordPerfect is used to calculate the averages and the percentages of the scored questions as well as to report the survey summary. For this past educational season, nearly 600 surveys from 19 counties were included in the summary.

We are challenged to measure a monetary value of the PSEP via a survey of applicators. What questions do you ask in your surveys? If colleagues have suggestions, we welcome them.

Larry Schulze / Clyde Ogg
University of Nebraska

North Dakota
Andrew Thostenson

Another training season is drawing to a close and an application season is now underway. It was another big training year. At the time of this writing, about 1,100 commercial and 7,000 private applicators have completed their certifications. In order to accomplish this, about 130 trainings were held at the state and county extension level. The training season is not quite over, but by the end of May it will be. Our attention will then turn to planning for the 2004 season. For all those who organized and participated in the trainings, we, in the state office, want to extend our thanks.

This past 2002 application season saw huge problems in the enforcement arena and we highlighted those problems at our trainings. It is our hope that all applicators and dealers will take a second look at how they and their neighbors conduct business in 2003 so we can demonstrate to consumers that we are indeed professionals. Below is a list of unlawful acts that all should be mindful of as the North Dakota Department of Agriculture will be particularly aggressive in prosecuting them this season:

- Canadian pesticides cannot be legally used in the United States
- Off label pesticide use is illegal. The most notable abuses are listed below:
  - Reclaim and Transline use on canola and sugarbeets
  - Assure II use on sunflowers and flax
  - Glyphosate as a harvest aid on mustard and dry beans
  - Authority on sunflowers
  - Various insecticide cocktails in bee hives
  - Fumigant sales to non-certified applicators
  - Human exposures to pesticides
  - Dumping of pesticides or rinsates

Ohio—Cindy Folck

West Nile Virus
The Pesticide Education Program at the Ohio State University is working cooperatively with the Ohio Department of Health on educational efforts regarding West Nile Virus (WNV). In March 2003, a satellite conference was viewed by over 500 people in Ohio and across the nation. Several WNV meetings and workshops are being conducted throughout Ohio, including ULV droplet testing of mosquito spraying equipment. Public information and education were also identified as priorities for our collaborative effort. Media releases about protecting horses and humans, and reducing mosquito breeding sites were sent to all media sources throughout the state. In addition, posters were created for farms and homes. Brochures on human protection were translated into Spanish for distribution.

Commercial Applicator Recertification
This was a record year for attendance at the Pesticide Applicator Training Commercial Recertification Conferences. Approximately 3,000 applicators attended the four locations around the state of Ohio. A copy of the proceedings from the conferences is available by contacting our office at (614) 292-4070.

Wisconsin—Roger Flashinski

Turf & Landscape Focus Group
To guide us in our revision of the Turf & Landscape training manual and exam, UW-Extension and the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture jointly formed a focus group representing the green industry and others who are involved with turf or landscape pesticide applications (lawn care, parks, golf courses, athletic fields, landscapes, and public schools). Although many of the group’s suggestions and ideas will be incorporated into our next revision, the primary concern expressed by the group was that the training and exam should focus less on “IPMish” information and more on what an applicator needs to know.

With the possible exception of sole proprietors, the general
feeling was that application businesses have staff on board who already have gone through the “IPM decision-making process” with their clients, thus, it is not necessary to test every applicator’s intimate knowledge on such material. On the same token, they all saw value in the IPM information and agreed not to delete it entirely from the manual but, rather, retain it as reference material. Based on their comments, and after careful review by Extension and the Department of Agriculture, we have agreed to substantially reduce the amount of IPM material now contained as “testable” material, and move the remaining information into an appendix. As a result, we were able to reduce the amount of testable material by 25% in our first draft.

Iowa—Jerry DeWitt

As Pesticide Safety Educators, we frequently hear from some of our more vocal clients concerning our training programs and the perceived value of these efforts. Farmers may feel that they are subjected to unnecessary information and education or it may be “required”, etc. Why do they need to be there at these meetings? What is in it for them, etc.? In Iowa, we annually assess the attitudes and planned actions of a number of our farmers who attend our 300+ private pesticide educational meetings. Our current data set (N>7600+ farmers, 2002-3) shows an amazingly high number of our participants acknowledge the value in these programs. Data from just three questions on our survey point to high acceptance and perceived value of this program:

| Overall evaluation of this year’s Pesticide Applicator Continuing Instructional Course |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Disagree |
| 8. The information presented today was useful for my farm operation | (37%) | (60%) | (2%) | (0.3%) | (0.05%) |
| 9. The presenters were prepared and knowledgeable | (54%) | (44%) | (1%) | (0.05%) | (0.03%) |
| 10. Overall, how do you rate this program? | Excellent: 3803 (49%) | Good: 3641 (47%) | Fair: 214 (3%) | Poor: 19 (0.2%) |
Private Pesticide Applicator Training Evaluation  
University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension

This evaluation helps us improve our program. Your inputs are important. Thank you.

Training session town: ______________________ Date: _______________________

County: ______________________ Circle one: Initial Certification Re-certification

Please evaluate this training session by circling the appropriate number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Private Applicator Certification Study Guide</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of “Signs &amp; Symptoms of Pesticide Poisoning” circular</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the “Safe Transport, Storage &amp; Disposal” circular</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondo pesticide label exercise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of NebGuide “Protective Clothing &amp; Equipment”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of NebGuide “Pesticide Laws and Regulations”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you learn anything in this training about…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New information</th>
<th>Reinforced what I knew</th>
<th>Nothing new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New state regulation on minimum age for pesticide licensing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift reduction nozzles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The minimum length of time to keep RUP records</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A written agreement to allow the custom applicator to keep RUP records on behalf of a farmer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage and value of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonium sulfate &amp; its impact on hard well water for weed control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicide carryover</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom pesticide applications as a private applicator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New state regulations on pesticide license fees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your role and responsibility concerning pesticide storage security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of this session, I will . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider time of day for glyphosate application for best weed control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use IPM approaches to manage weeds, insects and diseases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider herbicide carryover potential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider drift reduction spray nozzles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the information provided in this session help save you money?  
___ Don’t know ___ No ___ Maybe ___ Probably ___ Yes. If so, how much? __________

How many acres are in your operation (cropland, pasture, and range)? __________

Comments:______________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

11/4/02