



# Arizona Department of Agriculture

## Office of Pest Management

1688 W. Adams Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007

(602) 255-3664 FAX (602) 542-0466

[www.azda.gov](http://www.azda.gov)

### NOTICE OF PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, April 10, 2013, 11:00 A.M.

Arizona Department of Agriculture  
1688 W. Adams Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Room 206

#### MINUTES

The following minutes are for the meeting held on Wednesday, April 10, 2013, in Room 206 at 1688 West Adams Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007 (The Department of Agriculture Building)

#### **I. 11:00 A.M.: Call to Order (Chairperson)**

##### **a) Committee Roll Call (Mr. Carlos Coyazo) –**

*Present:*

*Chairperson Kevin Etheridge, Ken Fredrick, Andrew Witcher, Carmella Ruggiero, Douglas Seemann, Robert Wagner*

*Absent:*

*Jack Latham*

#### **II. Approval of Minutes**

##### **a) January 24, 2013**

*MOTION:*

*To accept the minutes by Mr. Douglas Seemann*

*Second by Mr. Andrew Witcher*

*VOTE:*

*6-0*

##### **b) February 1, 2013**

*MOTION:*

*To accept the minutes by Mr. Ken Fredrick*

*Second by Mr. Douglas Seemann*

*VOTE:*

*6-0*

### III. OPM Updates and Reports

#### a) Budget (Ms. Houseworth)

**1. Current Financial Report (handout) -** *Ms. Houseworth states they had previously sent out the cash flow report for February and that the cash flow report for March was sent out by Mr. Robert Tolton the previous day. Ms. Houseworth informs the committee she will be discussing, specifically, the March cash flow document. She notes the only thing that has changed since the last meeting is that revenue have increased slightly, and the projected ending balance is approximately 1.8 million dollars. Ms. Houseworth explains the proposed legislative package, specifically the portion that deals with TARF fees, will impact the balance starting next year. Ms. Houseworth moves her discussion to the federal grant, she notes the federal grant does go on for 3 months past the projected dates on the cash flow document, those months being July, August and September. Mr. Etheridge asks if the increase is due to TARF filing. Ms. Houseworth states that yes, the reason for the increase is found mostly in the back TARF fees being collected. She went on to say that Mr. Etheridge made the comment, at the last meeting, that he thought there would be some increased activity. Ms. Houseworth states the OPM has seen some increased TARF activity and has also seen revenue from license fees increase. Mr. Etheridge offers compliment to Mr. Jack Peterson for the huge financial change from when the division was in Scottsdale. Mr. Etheridge notes how positive the change has been. Mr. Etheridge calls for any further discussion or questions on the budget item. None offer discussion or questions.*

#### b) Compliance (Mr. Craig)

##### 1. Questions on Snapshot

**a) January 2013 (handout) –** *Mr. Vince Craig discusses the Compliance Snapshot handout. He calls attention to the “Continuing Education Training” section and explains the numbers presented for that section represent all of the continuing education that the OPM will be performing for the entire 2013 year. Mr. Craig moves on to discuss the “Outreach” section and explains that Outreach is continued education offered to a licensee, or anyone within the same company who would perform the same duties, who is found to be in violation. Mr. Craig states Outreach is used in lieu of issuing a complaint against a licensee. Mr. Craig explains how Outreach allows the OPM to have a record of a licensee taking the continued education and allowing the OPM to have direct knowledge that the licensee is informed of the correct compliance directives; should the violation occur again, the licensee is held directly accountable due to having been exposed to the correct training in the past. Mr. Seemann asks, in regards to the “Continuing Education Applications Processed” section, what constitutes the “courses do not meet qualification for CE” footnote that references the 7 courses denied. Mr. Craig informs the committee of certain continuing education applicant courses that address items outside the direct line of pest control such as “being a safe driver”, “sales” and even “how to make the consumer happy”. Mr. Seemann then states it is the course topic and not a lack of proper submission of the application that causes these courses to be denied. Mr. Craig affirms the accuracy of Mr. Seemann’s statement. Mr. Craig goes on to say if a Continuing Education Application is not submitted properly, Mr. Ron Walker will call the applicant and have them resubmit or fix the application. Mr. Seemann asks what the turnaround time for these applications is; what is the time between when it is received and when it is approved. Mr. Craig responds by saying that he believes, in rule, compliance has 20 days. Mr. Seemann inquires as to the average number of days to process.*

*Mr. Craig says it is an average of 15 days. Mr. Jack Peterson interjects, to avoid any misunderstandings, noting there is actually an official time frame the OPM is required to follow. Mr. Peterson informs the committee that Mr. Walker is actually operating under the time frame; the OPM has up to 75 days to process. Mr. Seemann asks how long the courses, once approved, are able to be conducted. Mr. Peterson responds with “2 years”. Mr. Robert Tolton interjects saying unless it is a specialized course like a speaking event/workshop, then approval is only given for 90 days.*

*Mr. Ken Fredrick asks what warrants a license suspension. Mr. Craig responds by saying if there is a violation that results in a citation whereby the violator is to comply either by obtaining CE or perhaps paying a penalty fee and the violator does not comply with the order, then their license is suspended. Mr. Fredrick asked if the violator does follow through with the order, will they get their license back. Mr. Craig responds by saying if the violator does follow through with the order, then a memorandum is drafted and taken to the Acting Director and from there a determination will be made.*

*Mr. Seemann calls into discussion the advisory notice, specifically the part that address violations of the weed control exemption. Mr. Seemann asks if these violations are specific to landscapers. Mr. Craig states these are actually anyone who violates the weed control exemptions. Mr. Craig goes on to state under A.R.S. §32-2311(6)(c), if there is a violation, the OPM must issue this notice. Mr. Seemann calls attention to the fact that the OPM does not regulate those people (referring to landscapers), so they receive the notice and disregard it. Mr. Craig says with the passing of the new bill, the OPM will not have that issue anymore. Mr. Peterson offers clarification on the Outreach program by saying the Outreach option is offered only when the OPM feels it is appropriate and not when someone has a total disregard for what they are doing; the OPM must feel that there was a true lack of understating. Mr. Peterson goes on to say the CE hours taken as a result of the Outreach program are additional CEUs, and do not count towards required CEUs for the year.*

*Mr. Etheridge called for additional comments. None were made.*

**b) February 2013 (handout) - This was addressed above (January handout).**

**c) March 2013 (handout) - This was addressed above (January handout).**

## **2. Industry Correspondence**

### **c) Licensing (Mr. Tolton)**

#### **1. Questions on Snapshot**

**a) January 2013(handout) -** *Mr. Tolton asks the committee if there are any questions regarding the Snapshot handout. Mr. Fredrick asks about the subject of approving business names for business applicants; he wants to know if the OPM needs to approve the name of a business. Mr. Peterson states that the OPM does not evaluate or issues approval of business names. Mr. Peterson goes on to state it is the duty of the Arizona Corporation Commission to approve business names. Mr. Tolton states that the OPM is taking the business names as they come; if the company name has approval from the Arizona Corporation Commission or the Arizona Secretary of State, then the OPM will move forward on it. Mr. Tolton goes on to state within the last few months, there have been some really “close” names – names that the OPM would not have accepted in the*

past. Mr. Tolton informed the committee that the OPM does notify the business applicant that their name is very similar to an existing business and they may be subject to civil action if another existing business feels that an infringement upon their name has occurred. Mr. Etheridge calls for any further comments. Mr. Tolton calls attention to the March Snapshot and notes the significant increase in the number of new business applicants - 18 in the month of March alone. He goes on to say 11 of those new business applications actually happened in the first 2 weeks of March. Mr. Tolton states the OPM is steadily increasing in the number of businesses. Mr. Tolton explains the numbers at the end of March as being: 1171 businesses licensed with the OPM, over 1500 Qualifying Parties and 7500 Applicators. Mr. Tolton goes on to discuss the Applicator renewals saying there were 7491 renewals mailed; 209 of those renewals have been returned, being undeliverable as addressed. Mr. Tolton informs the committee of how the returned renewals are being handled – they are being scanned and emailed to the email address on file. Mr. Fredrick issues comment on how one of his techs is one of those 209. Mr. Fredrick asks if all his tech needs to do is call up here and give the OPM his email address for the renewal. Mr. Tolton responds with a yes. Mr. Tolton goes on to say thus far, 710 renewals have been submitted online, 82 submitted by mail and 12 were hand delivered. Mr. Tolton informs the committee the OPM is trying to drive its customers towards using the online system for the renewals. Mr. Tolton reiterated, from what was discussed at the last PMAC meeting, stating the OPM is not mailing out licenses for renewals; however, newly licensed individuals will be mailed a license. Mr. Tolton goes on to discuss how the licensees can print their own license from the “My Account” system online or when they have reached the end of the online renewal process. Mr. Tolton issues a reminder to the committee that late fees this year start on June 1<sup>st</sup>, and renewals must be postmarked by May 31<sup>st</sup> in order to be consider timely. Mr. Fredrick asks if the YTD QP number of 1651 includes those that renewed this fiscal year. Mr. Tolton says yes it does included renewals. Mr. Tolton goes on to say that as of fiscal year-to-date, there have been 96 new QP applicants and 22 broaden applicants; 150 new and 32 broadening have been able to test this FY. Mr. Tolton states as of the end of March, only 315 exams have been taking by QP applicants. Mr. Seemann asks, assuming that the new bill gets passed, are we starting to develop a plan for the people that are inactive since that is going to go away. Mr. Tolton responds with a yes that he is working on timeframes and how that process will play out. Mr. Seemann asks specifically about inactive applicators, asking if they will disappear. Mr. Tolton says yes, the inactive license in itself will disappear and there will be a time and place to notify everyone well in advance. Mr. Seemann asks about businesses that have no active QPs. Mr. Seemann wants to how those will be addressed. Mr. Tolton informs the committee that businesses without a current QP, at time of renewal, cannot renew. Mr. Tolton states businesses may be invalid during that year, but at renewal cannot renew. Mr. Seemann asks if that goes away and they want to wait 6 months and open up again, will the business be able to do so. Tolton responds by saying he believes, with the new legislation, that an expired business license can be renewed if certain qualifications are met. Mr. Peterson asks Mr. Tolton if he is going to put up, on the website, the ones that have not renewed. Mr. Tolton responds that he intends to do so. Mr. Fredrick comments disbelief that a Sun Devil Pest and Termite name was not already in existence (Mr. Fredrick is referring to one of the new businesses listed as newly licensed). Mr. Tolton informs the committee of that company having opened and closed its doors several times. Mr. Witcher calls attention to the name “Wild West” in the Qualifying Party field of the newly licensed business. Mr. Witcher asks if that is a typo. Mr. Tolton informs the committee of the fact that Wild

*West is actually the name of a person.*

b) February 2013 (handout)

c) March 2013 (handout)

**2. Industry Correspondence**

a) 2014 Applicator License Renewals

**3. Business Licenses issued during January 2013**

|    | <b>Business Name</b>                | <b>City</b> | <b>Business Licensee</b>                 | <b>Qualifying Party</b> |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1  | BUZZ KILL PEST CONTROL              | MESA        | TODD GEER                                | TODD GEER               |
| 2  | G.O.N.E. PEST CONTROL SERVICES      | GILBERT     | LAWRENCE D. LEE                          | BRIAN DOHERTY           |
| 3  | GOOD GUYS PEST CONTROL, LLC         | PHOENIX     | GOOD GUYS PEST CONTROL, LLC.             | GUY NORWOOD             |
| 4  | GREEN KEEPER, LLC                   | HIGLEY      | GREEN KEEPER, LLC                        | JOHN BERGSTROM          |
| 5  | GREENTREE PEST CONTROL, LLC         | SURPRISE    | GREENTREE PEST CONTROL, LLC              | ADAM KOBEL              |
| 6  | J.CO PEST SERVICES, LLC             | QUEEN CREEK | J.CO PEST SERVICES, LLC                  | JOSE COLAZO             |
| 7  | OCM, LLC                            | BUCKEYE     | OCM, LLC                                 | ALAN LADD               |
| 8  | RUMBLE SPRAY, INC                   | ZILLAH, WA  | RUMBLE SPRAY, INC.                       | EDWARD SHELTON          |
| 9  | SUN LAKES – CASA GRANDE DEVELOPMENT | ELOY        | SUN LAKES – CASA GRANDE DEVELOPMENT, LLC | RANDALL CORDERMAN       |
| 10 | WILD WEST EXTERMINATING, INC        | CAREFREE    | WILD WEST EXTERMINATING, INC             | WILD WEST               |

**4. Business Licenses issued during February 2013**

|   | <b>Business Name</b>                           | <b>City</b> | <b>Business Licensee</b>                       | <b>Qualifying Party</b> |
|---|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | A&J WEED CONTROL                               | PHOENIX     | JOSE JESUS MARTINEZ                            | JOHN KING               |
| 2 | AARDVARK PEST CONTROL                          | PEORIA      | AARDVARK PEST CONTROL, LLC.                    | DAVID WAIER             |
| 3 | M. ANDERSON CONSTRUCTION CORP.                 | TUCSON      | M. ANDERSON CONSTRUCTION CORP.                 | JESUS FIGUEROA          |
| 4 | MARQUIS PEST CONTROL SERVICES, LLC.            | PHOENIX     | MARQUIS PEST CONTROL SERVICES, LLC.            | JEFFREY MARQUIS, II     |
| 5 | PEST HOME DEFENSE                              | QUEEN CREEK | PEST HOME DEFENSE, LLC.                        | NORMAN BRICE            |
| 6 | PRO ADVANTAGE, LLC.                            | GLENDALE    | PRO ADVANTAGE, LLC.                            | TRAVIS SMITH            |
| 7 | REVELATION LANDSCAPE WEED & PEST CONTROL, LLC. | SURPRISE    | REVELATION LANDSCAPE WEED & PEST CONTROL, LLC. | DANIEL MONSON           |
| 8 | SHERMAN'S PEST CONTROL                         | PHOENIX     | DAVID SHERMAN                                  | DAVID SHERMAN           |

**5. Business Licenses issued during March 2013**

|   | <b>Business Name</b>          | <b>City</b> | <b>Business Licensee</b>     | <b>Qualifying Party</b> |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | AGASSIZ LANDSCAPE GROUP, LLC. | FLAGSTAFF   | AGASSIZ LANDSCAPE GROUP, LLC | WILLIAM SPELLMAN        |
| 2 | AZ BEE SPECIALISTS, LLC.      | PHOENIX     | AZ BEE SPECIALISTS, LLC.     | STEVEN DURFEE           |
| 3 | BARKLEY SEED, INC.            | YUMA        | BARKLEY SEED, INC.           | MICHAEL EDGAR           |

|    |                                          |             |                                            |                          |
|----|------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4  | ECOFORCE HEAT SYSTEMS, LLC.              | PEORIA      | ECOFORCE HEAT SYSTEMS, LLC.                | RYAN GOODELL             |
| 5  | EXODUS EXTERMINATING                     | PEORIA      | EXODUS EXTERMINATING, LLC.                 | RICHARD SCHILK           |
| 6  | GUARDIAN ENERGY SOLUTIONS                | TEMPE       | GUARDIAN ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC.            | BRIAN KIRKLAND           |
| 7  | INSECTEK PEST SOLUTIONS, INC.            | PHOENIX     | INSECTEK PEST SOLUTIONS, INC.              | THERON BOBBITT           |
| 8  | LAKE MAINTENANCE SERVICE                 | MESA        | RALPH MOODY                                | MARK LAUCH               |
| 9  | LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PROFESSIONALS, INC. | GILBERT     | LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PROFESSIONALS, INC.   | BRIAN NEVITT             |
| 10 | MASTERTECH PEST SOLUTIONS                | PHOENIX     | MASTERTECH PEST SOLUTIONS, LLC.            | BRENT AGEE               |
| 11 | MOJO ENTERPRISES, LLC.                   | CAVE CREEK  | MOJO ENTERPRISES, LLC.                     | CHARLES MANNING, JR.     |
| 12 | NORTH SCOTTSDALE PEST & WEED CONTROL     | SCOTTSDALE  | NORTH SCOTTSDALE PEST & WEED CONTROL, INC. | LUIS URREA, JR.          |
| 13 | PEST BUSTERS EXTERMINATING, INC.         | TUCSON      | PEST BUSTERS EXTERMINATING, INC.           | ALFREDO GONZALEZ, JR.    |
| 14 | SUN DEVIL PEST & TERMITE CONTROL         | SCOTTSDALE  | SUN DEVIL PEST & TERMITE CONTROL, LLC.     | THEODORE LAFFORTHUN, JR. |
| 15 | TITAN LANDSCAPE, INC.                    | SAHUARITA   | TITAN LANDSCAPE, INC.                      | DONALD MADY              |
| 16 | URBAN PEST MANAGEMENT                    | PHOENIX     | URBAN PEST MANAGEMENT, LLC.                | CHAD LITTLE              |
| 17 | VISION LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN, LLC.        | KINGMAN     | VISION LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN, LLC.          | DAVID STEHLY             |
| 18 | YOUR PEST CONTROL, LLC.                  | QUEEN CREEK | YOUR PEST CONTROL, LLC.                    | OSCAR TOLEDO             |

**d) Activities (Mr. Peterson)**

**a. Status of Legislation pertaining to Task Force recommendations** – *Mr. Peterson informs the committee the pending legislative bill did pass, 27 – 2 in the senate and 58 – 0 in the house. Mr. Peterson makes comment on the extensive amount of time and preparing that will be needed to accommodate the new legislation. He reminds the committee the legislation will go into effect 90 days after the close of the legislative session. He also notes the OPM will post necessary updates on its website as time progresses. Mr. Peterson makes comment on how the OPM will certainly be doing a lot of compliance assistance as the changes are implemented. Mr. Etheridge calls for further comment. None offer comment.*

**e) Pesticide use in Medical Marijuana production (Mr. Cullings)** – *Mr. Casey Cullings begins by passing out an article from the Tri-Valley Central.com site for the Casa Grande area. The article makes reference to a new marijuana facility that is opening up in Eloy. The article contains a lot about the law and what the businesses are doing to comply. The following is communicated to the committee by Mr. Cullings:*

*The overview and basic information in regards to medical marijuana is as follows: The medical marijuana dispensaries/stores have agents that include any officers of that company, employees, and volunteers who work for that company. The patients who are authorized to use medical marijuana are called Qualifying Patients. Caregivers are the people authorized to help the Qualifying Patients. In terms of helping the Qualifying Patients, the Caregivers can actually grow the marijuana on behalf of the patients, and they can carry the marijuana and bring it to the Qualifying Patients. Caregivers are limited to helping 5 patients at a time. Dispensaries can grow and sell marijuana, but they must be a non-profit organization. A Qualifying Patient can also*

grow marijuana as long as there is no dispensary within 25 miles of where the Qualifying Patient lives and permission is secured from the Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS). To qualify to be a Qualifying Patient, you must have a debilitating medical condition and get a doctor's recommendation. All the above groups such as the agents, patients and caregivers are all referred to as Card Holders. Cards must be renewed annually. The dispensaries must renew their licenses annually as well. ADHS enforces the medical marijuana laws. When the marijuana is grown, it must be done so in an enclosed, locked facility that can be accessed by card holders only. Currently, within the state of Arizona, there can only be up to 124 dispensaries. There can only be one dispensary per 10 pharmacies. There are pre-zoned areas where the dispensaries can be. If there should be multiple companies wanting a specific zone, a lottery is held to determine which company can set up a dispensary. A Qualifying Patient or a caregiver can grow up to 12 plants. There is no limit to the dispensaries in the number of plants they can grow. A Qualifying Patient or caregiver can hold up to 2.5oz of usable marijuana on their person. If the marijuana is being purchased from a dispensary, only 2.5oz can be purchased every 14 days. ADHS is required to keep confidential the addresses of dispensaries, the names of the Qualifying Patients, the names of the caregivers and the names of the agents. Currently there are only a small number of dispensaries open. Despite the requirement of confidentiality, the article did provide the address of a particular dispensary. This is probably due in part to general marketing and also due to the dispensaries having to apply to their local city council for zoning purposes in an effort to get their business approved. As far as pesticide application at dispensaries is concerned, because marijuana/hemp is considered a crop, the Department of Agriculture would be the agency to oversee such applications, not OPM. This could involve the dispensaries being Regulated Growers or for the applicators, themselves, being a Private Applicator. There is a possibility that the dispensaries could hire a Custom Applicator as well. There is no pesticide currently registered in Arizona that is registered for use on hemp. Any pesticide use on the plant would be off-label and therefore not allowed under pesticide laws. If they use any non organic pesticide or herbicide on the product, they must list it on the product label and on an inventory control list that ADHS reviews. Only ADHS enforces the labeling of the product and the review of the inventory control list. As far as the OPM side goes, there is a possibility that a dispensary may need pest control but not directly on the plants; the same situation may exist for home growers as well.

Mr. Seemann asks if home growers must grow their plants under lock and key just as the dispensaries do. Mr. Cullings replies with a yes. Mr. Cullings calls attention to the fact that due to the security required when growing these plants, it may not even be possible for a non-cardholder to gain entrance to treat the facility or the plants; Mr. Cullings informs the committee that he is not aware of the regulation surrounding this concern. Mr. Cullings states as far as the OPM and the Department of Agriculture goes, they will not know where the dispensaries are nor will they know where the home growing locations are. The Medical Marijuana Law prohibits the agencies from taking any effective enforcement actions against the dispensaries themselves. The laws states that dispensaries and their agents are not subject to prosecution, search or inspection (except by the ADHS), seizure or penalty in any manner or civil penalty by a licensing entity. If OPM or AZDA would find a violation, there is no enforcement action we can take. Mr. Fredrick asks if a dispensary calls and wants treatment for pest control of their location but not for the plants themselves and the pest control treatment happens to destroy some plants, is there legal recourse against the person who applied the pesticide at that location. Mr. Cullings is unable to provide an answer to that question at this time. Mr. Cullings notes that both the OPM and AZDA do have enforcement authority against the OPM businesses and the Custom Applicators. Mr. Cullings continues to say if an OPM business goes in and misuses a pesticide then the OPM can take action against that OPM licensed business. Mr. Cullings calls attention to the fact that the OPM and AZDA having the ability to report any pesticide misuse to the EPA. Mr. Cullings notes that this

*Medical Marijuana Law only protects the dispensaries and their agents from state enforcement not from federal enforcement; thus, reporting to the EPA any misuse, could be an option. Mr. Etheridge calls for any additional comments. None are given.*

**f) Draft Rules Package (Mr. Peterson)** – *Mr. Peterson reiterates that Governor Approval for the new bill must be obtained. Mr. Cullings informs the committee that the Governor’s office has put a moratorium on rule making; no agency that is under her view can do any rule making without her permission. Mr. Cullings goes on to say the legislation has a provision that the OPM can do exempt rule making. He says that this is a very fast process to get the rules immediately into effect; however, the Governor must give written permission for that to occur. Mr. Fredrick asks if any work has been done on the rules yet. Mr. Peterson say yes. Mr. Peterson goes on to say with the new rules, there will be a need for a lot of outreach and communication with the community to insure proper knowledge is possessed by all in the industry. Mr. Fredrick asks what the process will be for tweaking and changing the rules and will the task force be reconvening or will the OPM be doing that internally. Mr. Peterson informs the committee that the OPM will likely ask for input, however the changes being made are those required by the legislation. Mr. Cullings states Exempt Rule Making is actually faster than Emergency Rule Making. He explains Exempt Rule making authorization lasts until the end of the fiscal year 2014; this means that if in the first year OPM discovers problems, then resolution can be made quickly.*

**IV. Call to the Public (Chairperson) - Each speaker is limited to five minutes. This is the time for the public to comment. Pursuant to A.R.S. Section 38-431.01(H), action (if any) taken as a result of public comment will be limited to recommending the Acting Director study the matter, responding to any criticism, or recommend scheduling the matter for further consideration at a later date. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(H), the Committee may discuss, consider or make decisions only on matters listed on the Agenda...**

*Mr. Fredrick calls to the public for comments and questions. None are offered.*

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

*Mr. Fredrick calls to the committee members for any disclosures or communication. None are offered.*

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

**a) To Be Determined** – *Mr. Seemann suggests having the next committee meeting sooner rather than later in light of the new legislative package being prevalent. Mr. Fredrick suggests the month of June to hold the next meeting. Mr. Peterson suggests June 18<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Carmella suggests a start time of 10am. Mr. Etheridge comments on the possible need for the future meeting to be of greater length than typical. Mr. Peterson is in agreement with Mr. Etheridge. The next meeting is scheduled for June 18<sup>th</sup> at 10am*

**VII. Adjournment** – *Mr. Etheridge calls adjournment at 11:47am*