



PAUL R. LEPAGE
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND RURAL RESOURCES
BOARD OF PESTICIDES CONTROL
28 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0028

WALTER E. WHITCOMB
COMMISSIONER

HENRY S. JENNINGS
DIRECTOR

BOARD OF PESTICIDES CONTROL

July 27, 2012

Maine Potato Board, 744 Main Street, Suite 1, Presque Isle

MINUTES

Present: Eckert, Bohlen, Jemison, Flewelling, Granger

1. Introductions of Board and Staff

- The Board, Assistant Attorney General Randlett and staff introduced themselves
- Staff present: Jennings, Schlein, Tomlinson, Bills, Haley; Hicks via phone for part of the meeting

2. Minutes of the June 15, 2012, Board Meeting

Presentation By: Henry Jennings
Director

Action Needed: Amend and/or approve

- Granger referred to the last paragraph on page 5, saying that if one person is going to be identified by name then all should be, that making a general statement leads to a conclusion.
- Eckert remarked that the format was better than the last minutes.

Eckert/Flewelling: Moved and seconded approval of minutes

In Favor: Unanimous

3. Public Information Gathering Work Session

Public Law 2011, Chapter 510, repealed the statutory mandate for the deposit system for restricted-use pesticide containers. In order to implement the intent of the legislation, the Board will need to repeal Chapter 21 of its rules and the corresponding record requirements in Chapter 50. In addition, after reviewing the Board's report pursuant to Resolve 2011, Chapter 59, covering the use of Integrated Pest Management at schools, the Joint Standing Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry encouraged the Board to pursue rule amendments recommended in the report. Finally, the Board has developed a number of interpretive policies

over the years in response to questions about the meaning or intent of its rules or statutes. However, policies are not enforceable. Therefore, the Board believes it is prudent to incorporate interpretations into rule. Five different definitions have been targeted for rule incorporation. The Board is now soliciting informal public input on its rulemaking concepts prior to formally initiating rulemaking. Written comments may be sent to the Board's main office at Maine Board of Pesticides Control, 28 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333-0028, or e-mailed to henry.jennings@maine.gov.

- A question was raised about whether any of these would have to go before the Legislature. Jennings replied that they would not, because none of them are major substantive.
- Jennings stated that, at the last meeting, a question arose about whether government employees making recommendations should be required to have a license; currently there is no such requirement. Jemison said that Cooperative Extension has a policy requiring those making recommendations to be licensed, at least as a private applicator; there are currently three master-level applicators within Extension. Jennings pointed out that there is a statute that says you can't make recommendations that are inconsistent with the label. He said he isn't sure how we would implement that requirement, but that we could start with a definition.

Chapter 10

- No comments

Chapter 21

- No comments

Chapter 27

- Tom Hale, RSU 39 (Caribou) agriculture instructor, said he has no problems working with the IPM Coordinator, who is the building supervisor. Hale is a licensed applicator and has been in his position for 37 years. He does not see a problem with the IPM Coordinator in his RSU. He says the record keeping is fine; he's been inspected by John Haley and record keeping is up to date. He does not feel that the current requirements are a burden, but feels the beginning of year notice is not helpful, as students get a big packet on the first day of school and there's no way to know whether people read them. He makes all the recommendations and all the applications for the RSU, working with the IPM Coordinator. He says that having an ag program is beneficial. He suggested an exemption for greenhouses attached to schools. He said currently at Caribou Tech Center they give a paper notice to all students in the schools if there is to be an application in the greenhouse, and most end up in the trash. He said he does not apply pesticides unnecessarily and would like to be able to react faster than five days, which he could do if the greenhouse weren't attached. He trains all students on the Worker Protection Standard on the first day, even if they already have their card. He said that he also does all pesticide applications on the athletic fields and that they have a policy to only do them when schools are not in session.
- Jemison stated that if all RSUs were as organized as this one, there wouldn't be a need for change.
- John Haley remarked that when he started as an inspector, the IPM Coordinators were superintendents and principals, but the responsibility has been handed down and now is sometimes in name only. Sometimes people don't even know that they are the IPM

Coordinator. He said that from an inspector's point of view he has always felt that we need to put some teeth in the position; they need to be held accountable for having a plan in place for applications and accountable for what happens. He does not feel that the responsibility should be put on the applicator, but should be with the IPM Coordinator. Applicators are for profit and may not have the best interest of the school at heart.

- Eckert pointed out that most school systems do not have a farm, garden or horticultural program, and that the law was written for schools without expertise, but we're asking someone to take responsibility. In a situation where you have students learning to do the work you do, we want to promote teaching them well: how to protect their classmates, colleagues who are not necessarily in that program.
- Tom Hale replied that students are not allowed to use pesticides; he does all the applications himself. He does not do applications for crawling insects inside buildings; the IPM Coordinator hires a company. We teach kids to be as safe as possible, using the latest technology.
- John Hoffses from MSAD 1 (Presque Isle) has 40 students working usually, and around 80–85 during strawberry season. Students are given Worker Protection training and taught to be aware of the safety of customers on the farm.
- Eckert asked if there is a better way to notify students and parents if printed notices are not effective.
- Tom Hale replied that the beginning-of-year notice is good, but it is not doing the job; how to get people to read something? But the notice does put people on guard, so if they have a concern they know they can call the IPM Coordinator and ask what's going on. He would welcome parents to come and ask questions. He would like to find something to replace the five-day notice, as very few of them go home. He says he does do the posting, and his area is isolated, but that is not true at all schools.
- Eckert pointed out that the challenge with posting is that there are students who are chemically sensitive whose parents want to keep them home. Tom Hale agreed that it would be good to know who those kids are so they can be protected.
- Heather Spalding, MOFGA, noted that a lot of papers come home at the beginning of the school year and have to be signed and returned.
- John Haley said many schools in the area do that, which limits the number of people they have to contact.
- Jennings stated that it seems that many schools aren't doing notification anyway because they're only doing applications that don't require notification, so it seems like the beginning-of-year notice is just wasted paperwork that isn't accomplishing much. However, if you get rid of the beginning-of-year notice, and you do an application, it seems you would have to notify everyone.
- Tom Hale said he liked the idea of adding to other papers that have to be signed with a check box for notification.
- Tomlinson suggested that schools use e-mail to notify parents about applications.
- Jennings explained what was meant by reduce and consolidate. He said that there are a lot of details around records in Chapter 50 and we found that we were creating large stacks of paper that people had to keep, but weren't using. For details about specific applications, one can call the applicator, he has to keep those records anyway and labels and MSDSs are readily available on the Internet. The idea is to create a logbook which would include

applications, but also reports of pests. There is a requirement in Section 5 to record IPM steps, which include monitoring.

- Heather Spalding asked whether the online system developed for the notification registry could be worked into this, saying that the automated notification might be helpful to IPM Coordinators.
- Bohlen remarked that the idea is to simplify record keeping. He noted that there is a fair amount of noncompliance around record keeping and it would be better for busy people to have only the essential records and actually do them, than have lots of records and not having the time to do them. Make sure the record keeping targets what is needed. A good logbook that was actually completed would help improve compliance as well as keep track of critical pieces of information.
- Eckert said to make sure that when IPM Coordinators are trained they learn how to get labels and MSDSs and more information.
- Heather Spalding pointed out that most of these changes are about administration and that we shouldn't lose sight of what brought about the discussion, which was the initiative to eliminate the use of cosmetic pesticides on school grounds.

Chapter 50

- No discussion

4. Board Determination About Rulemaking Initiatives

At its May 11, 2012, meeting, the Board directed its staff to initiate rulemaking with a goal of finalizing amendments by the end of the calendar year. Three policy areas were targeted by the Board, including: 1) repeal of the restricted use pesticide container deposit rule, Chapter 21 and the associated records contained in Chapter 50; 2) incorporation of recommendations contained in the legislative report covering pesticide use at schools; and 3) incorporation of certain Board policy interpretations into existing definitions.

Prior to commencing formal rulemaking proceedings, the Board held Public Information Gathering Work Sessions at its June 15 and July 27 meetings. The staff needs to file the rulemaking paperwork no later than August 7. Consequently, the Board must finalize its decisions around which subjects to include and which concepts it supports.

Presentation by: Henry Jennings
 Director

Action Needed: Determine which rulemaking areas to include in the 2012 initiative

Chapter 10

- Jennings explained that the idea in changing the definition of Spray Contracting Firm is to incorporate the interpretation by the Maine Attorney General that if a business is incorporated then it is a Spray Contracting Firm.
- Randlett pointed out that it is not just a rule definition, but a statutory definition.

- Bohlen suggested a line be added to the definition that states that a corporation needs a separate license.
- Jennings then said the next thing was to deal with subcontracting. For instance, he said, if he had a contract to maintain the University of Maine and he subcontracted the grounds maintenance and then subcontracted for pesticide applications, then technically each of those would need to be licensed. There seems to be little value to this, only the person making the spray decisions should need to be licensed.
- **The Board unanimously agreed to use the language from the policy to amend the rule.**

- Jennings talked about the landlord/tenant policy, stating that the point was that landlords could give products to tenants as long as they are ones that don't become airborne. He said originally it was proposed that the Board define a list, but that doesn't solve anything unless the Board also amends the rule elsewhere that says that if they use those products they don't need a license. It has been suggested that the definition of distribute be amended so that landlords distributing these types of products don't need a license.
- Hicks suggested that landlords might have a hard time figuring out the proper use of no-pest strips, and she's not sure the Board should be suggesting they make pest decisions for their tenants.
- Jennings said the problem is that all it takes to get a distributor's license is \$20; there is no test. Therefore, we have no leverage. If they want to give their tenants 25 bug bombs, all they have to do is give us \$20 and they're set. So we're trying to steer them toward non-airborne products. We can't really make them get an applicator license to give stuff away.
- Hicks pointed out that no-pest strips give off gas.
- Eckert stated that the challenge is not only to make the list but to make sure people understand it. We're asking people with little training to interpret those lists.
- Hicks pointed out that for many people English is not their first language, and that many people don't read labels anyway.
- Eckert pointed out that if we define low-risk for this purpose, it may mean different things for different purposes.
- **Consensus was reached to leave it as a policy.**

- Jennings explained that there are two issues around antimicrobial copper. Technically, if it's a pesticide, you need an applicator's license to install it, and a distributor's license to sell it.
- Hicks said that she would consider it a pesticide.
- Tomlinson pointed out that the EPA is registering them, as well as nano-particles.
- Jennings said that in order for people to be able to install doorknobs and similar things without a license, the Board either needs to change the definition of commercial applicator and distribute, or just change the definition of pesticide.
- Bohlen suggesting exempting hardware.
- A discussion ensued about the difference between substances and treated articles.
- **Consensus was reached to amend the definition of distribute and commercial applicator to exempt hardware such as doorknobs and push plates.**

- Granger stated that there's a lot more to know that the unlicensed applicator doesn't know, such as IPM. If government employees are in the position to make recommendations they should know more than just what's on the label.
- Granger said that entry-level employees are trained in entomology or pathology and they are expected to identify a pest and then give advice. They should understand the implication of what they're doing.
- Jennings pointed out that taking a literal interpretation could mean that a teacher applying bug spray needs to have a license.
- Bohlen asked if a camp counselor who is being paid for that job needs to be licensed.
- Eckert said she thought it was OK, as long as parents are allowed some decision-making ability. There should be a sign-off.
- **Consensus was reached to amend the definition of commercial applicator, to exempt from licensing requirements teachers, etc., using language similar to what's currently in policy.**

Chapter 27

- Jennings said that the staff would like to see the IPM Coordinator position strengthened. Chapter 27 envisions that the IPM Coordinator will make the pest management decisions, but in reality that's not happening. They have become merely a record keeper. The idea is to have the IPM Coordinator sign off on all pesticide applications. This will solve communication issues, because if they have to sign off, then they're going to know about them. We heard that a lot of people appreciate training and want to have more. The beginning-of-year notice seems to push schools toward using low-risk products. Keep the notice, but add a check-off. Would like to include something so we know who the IPM Coordinators are.
- Eckert suggested that pesticide applicator training should emphasize that pesticide applications should be for safety purposes only and that the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes should be discouraged.
- Jennings pointed out that the statute talks about minimizing pesticide use, not minimizing pesticide risk. If the Board wants some language about minimizing the use of pesticides for aesthetic purposes they need to decide now, or decide to handle on the training side.
- Heather Spalding commented that other states that restrict the use of cosmetic pesticides have exemptions to allow treatment for stinging and biting insects.
- Jennings said that the resolve did instruct the Board to minimize the use of pesticides, but that he is more comfortable minimizing risk than minimizing use.
- Eckert remarked that what we heard was that what many of us consider aesthetics, others consider safety, so if we want to move in that direction we should put it in there.
- Flewelling commented that pesticides are used on school grounds for no other reason than aesthetics.
- Jennings said the language could be tweaked to say something about minimizing unnecessary use for aesthetic purposes, although it is doubtful anyone would know what that means.
- Eckert said that while it might not be enforceable it would be a concept that could be taught.

Eckert/Granger: Moved and seconded to direct the staff to initiate rulemaking consistent with today's discussion.

In Favor: Unanimous

5. Consideration of a Chapter 29 Variance Permit Request from Vegetation Control Services, Inc. to Control Woody Brush in Wetland Areas of the Transmission Line Connecting the Kibby Wind Power Project in North Western Maine

The Board can grant variances for the 25-foot setback required from surface water under Section 6 of Chapter 29. Vegetation Control Services, Inc. is seeking approval to treat woody brush in wetland areas along the transmission line when no water is present. The applicator will use a motorized backpack mist blower which allows foliar treatments that minimize herbicide drip.

Presentation By: Henry Jennings
Director

Action Needed: Approve/disapprove the variance request

Eckert/Bohlen: Moved and seconded to table item until the next meeting.

In Favor: Unanimous

6. Section 18 Emergency Registration Request for HopGuard (potassium salt of hop beta acids) to Control Varroa Mites in Managed Honey and Commercial Bee Colonies

The Division of Animal and Plant Health in the Maine Department of Agriculture, Food & Rural Resources is requesting that the Board petition EPA for a FIFRA Section 18 specific exemption for use of HopGuard (potassium salt of hop beta acids) to control Varroa Mites in managed bee colonies. Tony Jadczyk, State Apiarist, is seeking approval for use of this product with its different mode of action to aid growers in controlling this pest. He points out that a healthy bee keeping industry is needed to support Maine agriculture and that this product is essential to honey production and commercial bee operators. The request is supported by the registrant, BetaTec Hop Products, a wholly owned subsidiary of John I. Haas, Inc. Lloyd Schantz, Executive President, stated the company is in the process of pursuing a full FIFRA Section 3 registration with EPA.

Presentation By: Mary Tomlinson
Pesticides Registrar

Action Needed: Approve/Deny request to petition EPA for a Section 18 Specific Exemption registration for HopGuard for use with bees.

- Tony Jadczyk, State Apiarist, explained that there is a great need for more control for Varroa mites because the two products currently available are not effective. He also said that there are much higher viral loads with lower mite counts now than previously. In

the 90s there would be high mite counts, but no damage; now there is high damage with relatively low mite loads. The materials currently available, including the organic ones, can't be used when the bees are making honey because it would make the honey taste like Listerine. One product that can be used when the bees are making honey caused high brood damage and adult mortality. He said that Hopguard works; it is already registered in 22 states, some of them are places we get our bees from for crop pollination. It reduces the mite population quickly, can be used during honey production and can be used during cool weather. If mite populations can be reduced before winter or in early spring they might not be a problem in the summer. EPA is now allowing up to six applications per year, which means they can be done in the fall and spring. There is no death to the brood and no danger to beekeepers. Because other states allow this product, and bees are moved around, there is an issue of compliance if it's not okayed here.

- Tomlinson said she has spoken with EPA and they indicated that this is a national problem and the variance would definitely be approved immediately.
- Jadcak said this isn't a long-term solution because the mites are the vectors and it's the viruses that are killing the bees.
- Bohlen said he is concerned about repeated resistance and asked to what extent this is part of a structured approach to reduce resistance.
- Jadcak replied that they are looking for products that work in a different way and that they are not seeing a resistance to the current three products used. He said there is a resistance management statement on the label.

Granger/Eckert: Moved and seconded to approve the request to petition EPA for a Section 18 Specific Exemption for HopGuard for use with bees.

In Favor: Unanimous

[Procedural Note: Agenda Item 10(b) was discussed next, followed by Agenda Item 8.]

7. Development of the Board's Pesticide Notification Message

At its May 11, 2012, meeting, the Board directed the staff to develop a brief outreach message about pesticide notification intended to inform the public about its rights and responsibilities. Following the May 11 meeting, the staff distributed a draft poster to Board members seeking their input. Members unanimously supported the poster and it was subsequently e-mailed to municipalities, agricultural associations, environmental organizations, and members of the Board's mailing lists. At their June 15 meeting, the Board reviewed a new draft of its webpage and directed the staff to bring back an updated draft, a proposed revision to the retail sign, and a press release. The Board will now review staff efforts and discuss development of additional outreach materials and strategies covering Maine's pesticide notification laws.

Presentation By: Paul Schlein
Public Education Specialist

Action Needed: Provide guidance to the staff

- Schlein stated that the poster had been amended as directed and the press release, as approved, had been distributed. He thanked Dave Bell for his significant contributions to the editing of the text on notification that appears on the Board’s webpage. He explained the two versions of the revised retail sign and the revised website language.
- With respect to the webpage text on notification, Jennings said that a lot of work went into trying to incorporate the comments received at the last meeting, including Bohlen’s suggestion that there should be a message about talking to your neighbors, and the idea of a broader context of where pesticides might be used.
- Eckert said that if she was reading it for the first time she would have trouble understanding it. She asked whether it clearly invites people to contact the Board if they need help with the process. A decision was made to add language to this effect.
- Jennings referred to the retail signs, opining that the person in the pesticide aisle trying to decide what to buy is not likely to be the person who wants to be notified; also, there are other messages that we need to get to that person, such as “Read the label,” and “Get some expert advice.” If we put too much text on it, no one is going to read it. If we want a sign about notification it should go to doctors and people who deal with asthma.
- Discussion ensued about the purpose of the sign and the best messages to include. Bohlen said it should emphasize alternatives, not just more pesticides.

Consensus was reached to create a new retail sign incorporating, in bulleted form, four ideas suggested by Tomlinson: (1) Think first spray last, (2) Learn how to outsmart your pest—get expert advice, (3) Read the label first and (4) You may need to notify your neighbor.

It was also suggested that the staff request assistance from the marketing division at Department of Agriculture.

8. Review of Forestry Best Management Practices Intended to Prevent Discharges of Pesticides to Waters of the State

Due to recent federal court rulings, as of October 31, 2011, discharges of pesticides to waters of the state are prohibited unless covered by a Maine Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit. Maine has not finalized a general pesticide permit intended to cover pesticide applications made over or near water. Use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) will help prevent discharges of pesticides. The Board reviewed an initial draft of the BMPs at its June 15 meeting and will now entertain additional suggestions.

Presentation By: Mary Tomlinson
Registrar and Water Quality Specialist

Action Needed: Provide input to staff on the draft BMPs

- Dave Struble, Maine Forest Service, said that he has asked for comments from industry and people are wondering “how much this buys them,” why DEP is not handling this and what the final outcome will be. He pointed out that the use of pesticides is covered by the label, but it is DEP’s responsibility to create a permit and it will need to go through the full

legislative process, to which Randlett agreed. Struble said that by following the BMPs foresters can at least demonstrate that they were trying to do things properly.

- Tomlinson said that, based on questions about other states raised at the last meeting, she contacted Massachusetts and the EPA and, so far, no one is doing anything.
- Granger referred to number 5 and asked whether it is a requirement to report all spills to DEP.
- Tomlinson replied that they are the lead agency for spills and that they consult with BPC when necessary.
- Jennings stated that their standard is “a reportable quantity.” Under a federal statute about community right-to-know there is a number they legally have to report. Our law is “a significant spill,” which is not defined.
- Jennings referenced the comments received from Deven Morrill. He agreed with the revision of number 7, regarding mention of specific technology, but did not agree with the comment on number 21, regarding wind speed (*see below for decisions made*).
- Jemison recommended revising number 7 to reflect Morrill’s comments.
- Heather Spalding questioned the origin of number 24, and asked whether the goal is to not get chemicals into surface water or something else. She questioned whether 75 to 100 feet is adequate for aerial spraying.
- Jennings said that he believes the numbers came from timber harvesting rules, clearcutting not allowed around water. He said helicopter spraying is very accurate and those distances are adequate.
- Bohlen opined that buffer widths in general are difficult to determine, and the argument could be made that around streams it should be hundreds of feet. A 75-foot buffer is enough to prevent direct discharge, but looking at the health of the stream, runoff, etc., you’re not going to get enough protection from that distance.

Consensus was reached to make three minor changes: (1) Remove reference to the brand of premix in number 7, (2) hedge somewhat on the wind speed statement in number 21 and (3) remove “draft” from the document (but continue to call them “Interim Guidelines”). Once revised, send the document to the Forest Service, DEP and licensed forestry pesticide applicators.

9. Discussion About the Board’s Catchphrase – “Think First – Spray Last”

“Think First – Spray Last” has been in use as the Board’s Integrated Pest Management (IPM) catchphrase since approximately 1998. The original staff concept behind the catchphrase was to identify a simple, easy to remember phrase that would convey the basic tenets of IPM to the general public, for whom the phrase “Integrated Pest Management” isn’t easily understandable. Questions have arisen about whether “Think First – Spray Last” is the best phrase to convey that concept. The Board will now discuss the phrase and whether it can be improved.

Presentation by: Henry Jennings
Director

Action Needed: Begin a dialogue about the catchphrase

- Jennings explained the origins of the catchphrase. He said that the idea was to focus on homeowners, for whom IPM was too complicated. He said it gets a lot of positive feedback and that it is a great URL because it's easy to remember. There was no intent to insult professionals because we knew they understood IPM. He pointed out that there is a lot invested in it and it would take a lot of manpower to eliminate it.
- Granger suggested that we could continue to use that message for homeowners, but work toward something different for professionals and not use on documents intended for them. He thought it is a bit of an insult for professionals who are trying to do a good job.

10. Other Old or New Business

- Extension of permit to Ron Lemin for control of Giant Hogweed in Bangor—H. Jennings
- Other?

Petition for a FIFRA Section 18 Crisis Exemption for the Use of Gowan Malathion 8 Flowable on lowbush and highbush blueberries to control spotted wing drosophila.

- Tomlinson explained that there had been a reduction in rate on the new label and the lower rate has not been shown to be effective, whereas the higher rate had been. She said that she had been contacted by both Frank Drummond and David Hanley. She said the use had already been approved in both New Jersey and Michigan.
- Hicks said that she had done some research and that EPA has decreased the number of applications and rate to reduce ecological risk. New Jersey has other products listed for use on high bush blueberries. She looked at the ranges of risk quotients for freshwater fish and invertebrates and most of the other products would be as high or higher risk than the malathion at the higher rate. She explained that if the risk quotient is over 1 there is a concern and, of the seven she looked at, three were under for fish and two were under for invertebrates.
- Jennings said that he understood from Frank Drummond that only spinosad has a lower risk, but it costs \$70/acre and needs to be applied often, whereas malathion is \$5/acre.
- Hicks pointed out that spinosad has a three-day interval to harvest, whereas malathion is one day.
- Jennings stated that there is also a concern about residue, and because malathion degrades rapidly, residue is not a problem. Hicks agreed that there is no food safety issue.
- Bohlen questioned why the preharvest intervals vary widely between crops. Hicks explained that different plants have different rates at which they dissipate residue and also that tolerance varies by fruit and class of fruit.
- Dave Bell said that the spotted wing drosophila hadn't been found in blueberries yet, but that we need to be prepared. He said it might not be a problem, since harvesting started early.
- Discussion ensued about whether to go for a 15-day crisis exemption or a full Section 18 exemption this year. There was also discussion about what dates to use for the 15-day exemption. Tomlinson pointed out that for a Section 18 we would need a lot of economic loss data. She also noted that a Section 18 would automatically end December 31, and need to be done again for next year.

Eckert/Flewelling: Moved and seconded to authorize the staff to work with industry to work on the specifics of the crisis exemption (specifically dates) and a Section 18 exemption.

In Favor: Unanimous

11. Schedule of Future Meetings

September 7, October 26 and December 7, 2012, and January 9, 2013, are tentative Board meeting dates. The January meeting will be in conjunction with the Maine Agricultural Trades Show. The Board will decide whether to change and/or add dates.

Adjustments and/or Additional Dates?

- After a brief discussion, it was decided to have a one-hour open forum at the Agriculture Trades Show, rather than a regular Board meeting. The preferred day was Wednesday, January 9, and food would be provided.
- January 25 and March 1, 2013, were added as tentative Board meeting dates.

12. Adjourn

Flewelling/Eckert: Moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn at 12:48 PM.

In Favor: Unanimous