

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



APRIL 2009

CHEM

Table of Contents

Fumigation Practical	1
FWS Rejects EPA	1
ODAFF Rule Changes	3
Pesticides not Cause of Seabird Deaths	3
Pyrethrum in Short Supply	3
Maine Adopts Aerial Notification Registry	4
Arsenical Products being Canceled	4
Carbaryl Cancellations	4
Carbofuran Cancellations	4
Oregon List Priority Persistent Pollutants	5
Hotel Can be Sued	5
Gene-Pesticide Interactions Linked to Parkinson's	5
HUD Approves New Form	6
Fire Ant Quarantine Areas	6
EPA Revises Registration Review Schedule	7
School IPM Definitions	7
More on Ag-Mart	7
Pesticide Container Collections	7
Imidacloprid Review	7
Travel Agents Protest FAA Bill	8
EPA & 6 th Circuit Ruling	8
What Happens with Low Budgets	9
EPA Programs on Hold	9
EPA's Concerns	10
Soil Fumigants	10
Wheat Growers Approve Biotech	11
EWG Residue Analysis	11
Testing Dates & Locations	12
CEU's	14

FUMIGATION PRACTICAL

April 14, 2009 is the next Fumigation Practical. It will be held at the Stored Product, Research & Education Center (SPREC) just west of Stillwater on Range Road.

Applicators must have passed the Core and Fumigation (7c) category exams to attend.

Information has been sent to companies licensed in Fumigation.

Registration information is available at <http://pested.okstate.edu>

The next Fumigation Practical is scheduled for October. (OSU PSEP)

FWS REJECTS EPA

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has rejected as incomplete 47 consultation packages submitted by EPA regarding the potential impacts of various pesticides on a number of endangered species, asserting that the agency has not adequately addressed tank mixes or background pollution, among other deficiencies.

The service laid out its concerns in January to Artie Williams, associate director of the Environmental Fate & Effects Division within EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs.

"The service has not received all of the information necessary to initiate formal consultations on the re-registration of these pesticides as outlined in the regulations governing interagency consultations," Marjorie Nelson, head of the Branch of Consultation and Habitat Conservation Plans in the FWS Division of Consultation, Habitat

Conservation Planning, Recover and State Grants, wrote.

The consultation requests cover the impacts of atrazine on 12 federally-listed endangered species, the impacts of 41 pesticide active ingredients, including aldicarb, azinphos-methyl, glyphosate and permethrin on the California Red-Legged Frog and the impacts of prometon and carbaryl on the Barton Springs Salamander. The consultation requests were received by FWS over a 19 month span, between March 2007 and October 2008.

All the requests were made pursuant to settlements of lawsuits brought by NGOs who alleged that EPA was not meeting its obligations under the Endangered Species act in its re-registration of the pesticides.

“We’re working through our next steps on these,” OPP Director Debbie Williams told a gathering of industry stakeholders and government officials.

“We don’t dispute that there are issues, our concern is whether or not we can address those in a reasonable timeframe to get protections out to species for the effects that we have identified as likely to adversely affect,” Edwards said, adding that FWS didn’t call for EPA to develop any new data for species.

Angela Somma, director of the Endangered Species Division in the National Marine Fisheries Service, said there have been questions about the surrogates used in the some of the effects determinations, an initial step whereby EPA assesses whether or not its actions are likely to adversely impact an endangered species or its critical habitat. If EPA concludes that its action is likely to adversely affect a listed species, it must pursue formal consultation with the relevant wildlife agency.

FWS requests the following pieces of additional information from EPA to complete the consultation initiation packages:

- A full description of the action to be considered, including “a list of all current product registrations for which consultation is being requested, the ingredients contained therein, the other ingredients in recommended tank mixtures, and any known toxicity data for these chemicals.”
- “A complete description of the manner in which the action may affect the listed species and their critical habitats, including an exposure analysis that represents reasonable worst case scenarios for both the entire action area and for individual portions of the action area relevant to the listed species and designated critical habitats under consultation.”
- “An estimate of existing and future pollutant loads in the action area as a basis for determining whether listed species are likely to be adversely affected by the addition of the pesticide products and, if so, an analysis of the extent of effects over the re-registration period.”

Speaking to some of the broader issues that have hindered progress in this area, the letter noted that the volume and complexity of EPA’s consultation requests on pesticide re-registrations exceeds FWS’s capability to complete consultations within normal statutory deadlines.

“We would be happy to continue to discuss with EPA ways in which to best utilize our joint resources to address EPA’s consultation workload, including establishing priorities and realistic timelines given the service’s limited staff resources,” Nelson wrote. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37, No 15 February 16, 2009)

ODAFF RULE CHANGES

ODAFF had several proposed rule changes.

The proposed rule changes for preconstruction termite treatments was withdrawn as well as the proposed rules for the declaratory rulings, auditing, repeat offenders, show cause for renewals and the removal of the fine matrix from the regulations. The fine matrix is still being strongly discussed.

Other non-pesticide rules were also withdrawn.

It is probable that some of the rules will be re-proposed.

The rule changing the insurance requirement for aerial applicators was proposed to change to 100-300-100. (OSU PSEP)

PESTICIDES NOT CAUSE OF SEABIRD DEATHS

A mystery came to Monterey Bay in 2007: Hundreds of seabirds washed ashore looking and even smelling as though they'd run into an oil spill. The slimy substance that covered the struggling and dead birds smelled "like linseed oil", says Raphael Kudela, and associate professor of ocean sciences at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

But after water testing, the researchers found no indication of excess oil, pesticides, acids or commercial products that might have caused the foam and gooey coating on the birds. All told, 207 birds were found dead and 550 were stranded.

Now, the "mystery spill" has been solved. It wasn't the Cosco Busan oil spill in nearby San Francisco Bay or a controversial aerial pesticide spraying along the Central Coast. It was harmless-looking foam from an ordinarily non-toxic algal bloom churned up by November waves,

according to a study coming out of PLoS ONE.

This unassuming foam looks like "if you beat egg whites into a meringue and sprinkle a little dirt in with it", study co-author Kudela tells ScientificAmerica.com. Although the protein-rich froth didn't contain toxins, it acted as a surfactant, which lowers the surface tension of water—especially where it comes into contact with oil. This disabled the natural water-repellent coating on the feathers of floating loons, grebes, northern fulmars and other birds in the bay, soaking them through and rendering them susceptible to the chilly autumn Pacific water.

For humans in the area, the foam didn't appear to have any documented health effects. Kudela says that surfers complained of some respiratory problems and skin rashes. (Newsfood.com, March 3, 2009)

PYRETHRUM IN SHORT SUPPLY

The supply of pyrethrum has been at critical levels for quite awhile now and does not look to improve soon. The best way to explain the situation is to read this quote from a Kenyan news site: "Despite the potential to produce up to 20,000 metric tons of dried flowers, production has declined markedly within the last year resulting a paltry 1,000 metric tons."

Increased production in Kenya will not happen overnight so this shortage will be with us for the next several years. (Degesch America, Inc. Newsletter, Issue IVI)

MAINE ADOPTS AERIAL NOTIFICATION REGISTRY

The Maine Board of Pesticides Control unanimously agreed to amend outdoor pesticide use notification regulations to create a state aerial pesticide application notification registry.

The new registry “is intended to allow persons living or working near sites that may be treated with pesticides by an aerial applicator to receive advance notice of pending aerial applications,” the amended regulation reads.

Beginning in 2010, anyone who wants to be included in the registry for the current application season must submit their contract information on a board-approved form by March 15. If a person’s information is received after that date, they will be included in the registry the following year. Participants will remain in the registry until they notify the board that they no longer want to be included or if the board determines their contact information is not longer valid.

Anyone in Maine who has contracted for an aerial pesticide application is to review the registry – distributed by the board no later than April 1 each year – and notify any registrants living or working within 1,500 feet of the site of the impending aerial pesticide application at least one day before – but not more than one week before – the spraying is scheduled.

Notification can come in any form, including e-mail and phone, as long as the registrant is told: the name of the pesticide to be sprayed and its EPA registration number; the date and time of the application; an updated date and time of application if the spraying doesn’t occur at the initially scheduled date and time; and the contact information for the person who has contracted for the aerial application.

(Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37, No 17 March 2, 2009)

ARSENICAL PRODUCTS BEING CANCELLED

Companies have requested voluntary cancellation of a number of products. This is usually a result of market share or the cost or meeting registration requirements.

Since the arsenicals (MSMA, DSMA, AMA and Cacodylic Acid) are going through registration review and EPA is pushing for their total cancellation, it appears a number of the homeowner companies have begun voluntarily cancelling their arsenical products.

End users can apply these products until their supply is exhausted. (Federal Register, March 18, 2009)

CARBARYL CANCELLATIONS

Several companies have requested voluntary cancellation of use sites for their carbaryl (Sevin) products.

Many of the cancellations involve pea and bean, succulent shelled (subgroup 6B), wheat, bedding plants, foliage plants, liquid broadcast applications to residential lawns, outdoor pet sleeping quarters, poultry & poultry premises,

Persons using carbaryl products need to carefully read the labels prior to purchasing new product to ensure that the use sites desired are on the label. (Federal Register, March 18, 2009; OSU PSEP)

CARBOFURAN SLN CANCELLATIONS

FMC has requested voluntary cancellation of two State Local Need carbofuran uses for Oklahoma.

One is OK-81-0012 on grain sorghum and the other is OK-93-0001 on cucurbits.

EPA is allowing use of existing stock in the hands of the end user (applicator/farmer). (Federal Register, March 18, 2009)

OREGON LIST PRIORITY PERSISTENT POLLUTANTS

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality has listed its list of persistent pollutants. What is interesting is what is not on the list.

While California is dealing with pyrethroids in its watersheds and streams, of the 70 pesticides listed by Oregon DEQ none were pyrethroids. (<http://www.deq.stae.or.us/SB737>)

HOTEL CAN BE SUED

A federal appeals court has ruled that a lawsuit against Marriott Hotel Services and a cleaning and pest-control company should go to trial, reversing a lower court ruling.

The women who filed the negligence suit allege that a pesticide sprayed in their Maui hotel room – after they reported a dead cockroach – made them sick.

“A jury reasonably could find that defendants were negligent in inundating an occupied hotel room with pesticide spray in the absence of any warnings to the occupants,” the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit said.

Michiganers Elizabeth Gass and Deborah Dejonge said they felt sick a short time after coming back to their room to find exterminators there. Six weeks later they were still reporting symptoms to their doctors back in Michigan.

The U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan found no direct connection between the pesticide and the women’s symptoms.

The Sixth Circuit ruling sends the case back to district court for a trial or settlement.

Gass and Dejonge are seeking more than \$50,000. (Pesticide & Toxic chemical News, Vol. 37 No18, March 9, 2009)

GENE-PESTICIDE INTERACTIONS LINKED TO PARKINSON’S

Pesticide exposure and genetic variability in the dopamine transporter (DAT), a protein that plays a central role in dopaminergic neurotransmission of the brain, interact to significantly increase the risk factor for Parkinson’s disease, according to a new study by University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) researchers. The population based case-control study, builds on the existing body of evidence of animal data and epidemiological studies that link exposure to pesticides, including gene pesticide interactions, to Parkinson’s disease. The UCLA researchers, looking at incident Parkinson’s disease cases in three rural counties in Central California, find DAT increases in risk of Parkinson’s when individuals have occupational or residential exposure to pesticides. This is the first epidemiologic study of Parkinson’s disease that relies on pesticide data that is from a record-based source versus recall-based data relying on individuals’ memory.

The new UCLA study is based on 324 cases and 334 control subjects that contributed to risk factor and genetic data and genotyped for the DAT variants. For residential exposures, the researchers used a GIS computer model based on California state required Pesticide Use Reporting data, land use maps, and residential histories, estimating both maneb and paraquat exposure near study subjects’ homes. Estimates were also calculated for agricultural occupational maneb and paraquat exposure. Fifteen percent of the study subjects are considered both

occupationally and residentially highly exposed to maneb and paraquat.

According to the study, an individual can have up to four DAT susceptibility alleles, two copies of the A clade 5' region and two copies of the 9-repeat 3' VNTR. After assessing the interactions between exposure to both pesticide measures and the number of DAT susceptibility alleles, the researchers find that Parkinson's patients are more likely to have been exposed to pesticides. High residential exposure to both paraquat and maneb between 1974 and 1999 more than doubled the risk of the disease, while occupational exposure increased the risk about 50%. DAT susceptible alleles as well as an allele dosage effect with increasing number of susceptibility alleles. High residential exposure to maneb and paraquat increased risk almost 3-fold in individuals who have on DAT susceptibility allele and 4.5 fold in those with two or more susceptibility alleles. Researchers do not believe that DAT susceptibility allele(s) are impacting risk for those not exposed to maneb and paraquat. (Beyond Pesticides, March 2, 2009)

HUD APPROVES NEW FORMS

U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) has approved the new HUD-NPMA-99A and HUD-NPMA-99B. The use of the forms is authorized immediately and existing stocks of the previous forms, NPCA-99a and NPCA-99b, may be used until supplies are exhausted; however, some lenders may require the new forms immediately. The new forms expire February 20, 2012.

The HUD-NPMA-99A, called the Subterranean Termite Protection Builder's Guarantee, is completed by the builder and specifies whether the work was done by the pest control company or the builder (in the rare case of using extensive pressure treated

lumber as termite prevention). The form clearly delineates the responsibilities of the builder and the builder must guarantee that any work done complies with the building code.

The HUD-NPMA-99B, now called the New Construction Subterranean Termite Service Record, is completed by the pest control company and now includes all code-accepted methods into one service record. The code-accepted methods include Soil Applied Liquid Termiticide, Wood Applied Liquid Termiticide, Bait System Installed, and Physical Barrier System Installed.

Samples of the new forms can be viewed at www.npmapestworld.org/HUD.asp.

The new forms may be purchased online from NPMA (National Pest Management Association) at www.bugsotre.org or by calling the Resource Center directly at 703.352.6267.

Sample forms are at the end of the newsletter. (PCT Online, March 5, 2009)

Note: Pretreat and post construction treatments still require applicators to meet ODAFF minimum standards.

FIRE ANT QUARANTINE AREAS

ODAFF is proposing to expand the red imported fire ant quarantine area to meet federal regulations.

The new counties would be Atoka, Coal, Cotton, Garvin, Jackson, Jefferson, LeFlore, Murray, Pontotoc, Pushmataha, Stephens and Tillman counties.

Counties currently under quarantine include Bryan, Carter, Choctaw, Comanche, Johnston, Love, Marshall, and McCurtain.

The quarantine means regulations on movement of plant and soil material out of the quarantined areas.

For more information, contact either Rick Grantham with OSU (405.744.5531) or Jeanetta Cooper with ODAFF (405.522.5971). (OSU PSEP)

EPA REVISES REGISTRATION REVIEW SCHEDULE

EPA announced on March 11, 2009 that the agency was revising its registration review process. One of the major changes is EPA is moving the neonicotinoids (acetamiprid, clothianidin, dinotefuran, imidacloprid, nitropryrin, thiacloprid, and thiamethoxam) up in the process due to the concerns revolving around bees.

EPA has moved these up to 2012. (Federal Register, March 11, 2009)

SCHOOL IPM DEFINITIONS

Virginia has enacted a school IPM program. They define IPM as “integrated pest management shall mean a managed pest control and suppression program that uses various integrated methods to keep pests from causing economic, health-related, or aesthetic injury and minimizes the use of pesticides and the risk to human health and the environment associated with pesticide applications. Methods may include the utilization of site or pest inspections, pest population monitoring, evaluation of control requirements, and the use of one or more pest control methods including sanitation, structural repair, non-chemical methods, and pesticides when non-toxic options produce unsatisfactory results or are impractical.”

Texas Department of Agriculture is proposing a definition of IPM for its school IPM regulations.

TDA defines IPM as “A pest management strategy that relies on accurate identification and scientific knowledge of target pests, reliable monitoring methods to assess pest presence, preventative measures to limit pest problems and thresholds to determine when corrective control measures are needed. Under IPM, whenever

economical and practical, multiple control tactics should be used to achieve best control of pests. These tactics will possibly include, but are not limited to, the judicious use of pesticides.” (PCT Online, March 5, 2009 and TDA e-mail)

MORE ON AG-MART

The North Carolina Pesticide Board decided it could prove only six of about 200 worker safety accusations that had been leveled at Ag-Mart. Therefore, the Board fined the company \$3,000 for allowing workers to return to the fields too soon after the fields were sprayed. The state originally wanted to fine the company nearly \$185,000. The fine is in addition to a \$21,000 fine for unrelated Worker Protection Standard violations such as burning pesticide containers.

This ended a three year case and prompted North Carolina to overhaul its pesticide regulations. (The News & Observer, February 20, 2009)

PESTICIDE CONTAINER COLLECTIONS

You have heard from us many times encouraging applicators to participate in the free pesticide container collection program.

Since 1992, over 1.1 million pounds of pesticide containers have been chipped in Oklahoma. This is 1.1 million pounds of solid waste that was not land filled. (OSU PESEP & ACRC)

IMIDACLOPRID REVIEW

EPA is reviewing imidacloprid’s registration as required by law.

EPA initially finds there is little concern over dietary and drinking risk concerns. However, EPA will require an immunotoxicity study be conducted for registration approval. EPA is also

concerned about residential exposure due to leaching from treated wood.

All assessed residential handler and post-application exposures and risks do not exceed Health Effects Division (HED) level of concern. HED stated “Provided commercial pesticide handlers use label prescribed personal protective equipment, all assessed exposures are not of concern.” There are occupational exposures that have not been tested. Some include mixer/loaders for dry flowable and/or wettable powder formulations; seed treaters using dry or Ready-to-Use formulations; mixer/loader/applicators using backpack sprayers; and others. (Docket: EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0844)

TRAVEL AGENTS PROTEST FAA BILL

Citing the cost, the American Society of Travel Agents, the Interactive Travel Services Association and the Business Travel Coalition asked members of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to remove a pesticide provision from the Federal Aviation Administrations reauthorization bill.

The provision would require that air travelers be advised before purchasing a ticket whether an insecticide, identified by name, has been applied in the aircraft in the last 60 days or will be applied while the traveler is on the aircraft.

“This is a complex issue with significant international implications,” the groups wrote to Reps. Jim Oberstar (D-MN) and Jerry Costello (D-IL). “Tracking insecticide applications would involve a major investment in software and training that would amount to a significant unfunded mandate.” (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37, No 15 February 16, 2009)

EPA & 6TH CIRCUIT RULING

EPA is examining the concept of general permits in response to a recent ruling by the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals. The court ruled that pesticide applications on or near water are not exempt from permitting requirements under the Clean Water Act, as EPA had determined in a November, 2006 rule.

EPA’s is deciding whether to petition for a rehearing before the full 6th Circuit.

According to Linda Boornazian, director of the water permits division of Office of Water, EPA is looking at the idea of general permits that could be issued up front and either automatically cover farmers or applicators, or require them to file a notice of intent indicating they want to be covered by the permit. Either way, coverage could be obtained in a short time. By contrast, individual permits take 6-12 months to issue.

EPA is wrestling with the various scenarios that agriculture presents in needing a permit. For example, is the permit issue to an applicator or to a geographical area, the possibility of the applicator having to change chemicals due to weather conditions and so forth.

EPA is seeking input from industry and agriculture groups to better understand how to write a general permit.

Industry expressed significant concerns that the 6th Circuit ruling will overturn the current exemption from CWA permitting requirements enjoyed by agricultural storm water.

“The ag stormwater exemption says you’re exempt from being a point sources [and thus not subject to permitting requirements] if through your irrigation system you have applied [a pesticide] to your crops and the water runs off from your cropland to the waters of the United States – that’s ag stormwater; if you are aerially

spraying it on your crops, that'll also be ag stormwater," Boornazian said.

EPA is still looking at whether spray drift is also covered. "That's still in the decision making process," Michelle Knorr with EPA's Office of General Council added.

EPA is considering its options should its petition for rehearing be denied, there are also questions about the geographic reach of the ruling. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37, No 16, February 23, 2009)

WHAT HAPPENS WITH LOW BUDGETS?

With many states experiencing major budget issues, what do they cut?

Key pesticide programs in Washington and Oregon could fall victim to ongoing budget cuts.

In Washington, several programs face the ax under Gov. Christine Gregoire's budget plan as they close an overall deficit of some \$5.8 billion. Gregoire has called for the elimination of three pesticide advisory and review boards along with deep cuts to the Department of Health's program for monitoring the health effects of pesticide use. The DOH pesticide program could lose nearly half its \$1.6 million budget, and its staff looks set to be cut from 7.5 to 3.4 "full time equivalent" employees.

The governor has also suggested cutting the budget for the Washington Poison Center – considered another key source of information about pesticide poisonings – by 50% to \$1 million.

Proposed budget cuts in Oregon threaten the state's pesticide use reporting system, which is set for elimination under Gov. Ted Kulongoski's plan to solve his state's estimated \$1.2 billion shortfall. The cut would save some \$400,000, but environmentalists are hopeful that

lawmakers will see the value of the program and keep it off the chopping block.

The program requires applicators to report pesticide use to the state, which publishes the information in a publicly accessible database. The state began collecting the data in 2007.

In California, the proposal is to roll back its compliance requirement for volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

The proposal would lower mandatory reductions of pesticide-related emissions that produce VOCs – key ingredients in smog – from 20% to only 10% in Ventura County and from 20% to 12% for the San Joaquin Valley and southeast Desert areas. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37, No 15, February 16, 2009)

EPA PROGRAMS ON HOLD

EPA's Endocrine Disrupter Screening Program (EDSP) is currently in limbo, per the dictates of a memo from the White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel putting all pending rules and guidance documents on hold. But EPA still plans to move forward with the program in 2009, OPP Director Debbie Edwards stated.

"Right now we're planning to brief Lisa Jackson (EPA administrator), but we need to get on the schedule and find out from her what next steps she'd like to pursue and what her timeline will be for moving forward.

On spray drift, Edwards noted that a working group formed in 2006 under EPA's Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee recommended in April 2007 that OPP issues a Pesticide Registration (PR) notice to standardize language related to spray drift on pesticide labels.

EPA put together an internal

workgroup and developed a drafted PR notice, along with a *Federal Register* notice, and submitted both of them to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review last August. But they, like the EDSP materials, have now been withdrawn, Edwards said.

The White House memo also put on hold pesticide tolerance actions, Edwards noted. OPP still needs to get approval from Administrator Jackson to move forward and publish them – and expects to get that approval within the next few months.

Edwards said nothing is being delayed “in any significant way.” (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37, No 15, February 16, 2009)

EPA’S CONCERNS

OPP director Debbie Edwards told an audience that the Agricultural health Study (Iowa & North Carolina farm families) has found statistically significant associations between some pesticides and some cancers that are not predicted in animal models.

“It’s incumbent upon us to figure out what does that mean in terms of our risk assessments,” Edwards said, adding that EPA has decided to get some advice from its FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel on how to integrate this information into its risk assessment process.

Another emerging area of concern, according to Edwards, is semi-volatile pesticides and their connection with air quality and long range transport issues. Internationally some of the pesticides, which are still registered in the U.S., are starting to be nominated for inclusion in international treaties like the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution.

OPP’s Health Effects Divisions

“working through ideas around what criteria you might use to determine whether you need to do a risk assessment for a pesticide for that exposure scenario and how best you might do it.”

She noted that recent data from the USGS indicate that some pesticides are being found in national parks and other areas where they are not used. They are moving off-site, not because of drift, but because of volatilization post-application.

“It’s incumbent upon us to be able to answer the question – is it a problem or not?” Edwards said, adding that there will be an SAP meeting on this topic at the end of the year. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 37 No 15, February 16, 2009)

SOIL FUMIGANTS

Members of OSU’s Pesticide Safety Education Program attended The Pesticide Stewardship Alliance program and obtained information about the status of soil fumigants.

Dirk Helder with EPA was present and made presentations and answered questions regarding EPA’s proposals.

From our perspective, EPA is staying the course with its proposed buffer zones and monitoring requirements.

Buffer zones would be determined by a number of factors beginning with the fumigant used. Then the application method, types of tarps used, distance to adjacent occupied buildings (both private and public), etc. would determine the size. Air monitoring would be required every hour to determine if levels were acceptable.

Community education (outreach) programs would be required as well as programs for first responders – fire and law enforcement.

Under certain conditions, if homes

were within a buffer zone the residents would be notified and either leave their home during the fumigation or the applicator would monitor the area during the application. (OSU PSEP)

WHEAT GROWERS APPROVE BIOTECH

More than three-quarters of wheat growers responding to a recent National Association of Wheat Growers survey approved a petition supporting the commercialization of biotechnology in wheat.

“Until now, there has only been speculation about the breadth of grower support for biotechnology in wheat,” said NAWG CEO Daren Coppock. “This petition was designed to gather those answers from across our wheat producing areas, and now we have an objective and clear answer.”

To date, the survey has enjoyed a 32% response rate, with approval rates similar across states and farm sizes. The survey was mailed in January and February to about 21,000 producers with more than 500 acres of wheat and 1,000 acres in total production.

More information about the petition and survey is available online at www.wheatworld.org/biotech.

For Oklahoma 37% of those sent the survey had responded and of those 79% supported biotech wheat. (National Association of Wheat Growers, March 3, 2009)

EWG RESIDUE ANALYSIS

The Environmental Working Group (EWG) has released a report on the “The Dirty Dozen”.

This report uses USDA’s Pesticide Data Program data from 2000 to 2007

and recalculates the data.

According to EWG, 100% of the peach samples had pesticide residues while the 2007 USDA-PDP report indicated that 96.3% of the samples had non-detection of pesticide residues.

It is all in how one counts and divides. (OSU PSEP)



Jim T Criswell
Pesticide Coordinator

PESTICIDE APPLICATOR TEST SESSIONS 2009

All 23 exams will be available at each session. **PLEASE MAKE SURE** you know in advance which specific exam(s) you need to take (e.g. Service Tech, Ornamental & Turf, Core, Right-of-way, General Pest, etc.).

RESERVATIONS ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR THESE TEST SESSIONS; they are all open to anyone wishing to test for certification. Tests are \$50.00 each; please bring check, money order or the exact amount of cash needed for testing, along with a form of photo ID. There is no fee for government employees in the discharge of their official duties.

Unless otherwise noted, sessions are located as follows:

ALTUS	WESTERN OK STATE COLLEGE 2801 N MAIN, RM A23
ENID	GARFIELD CO. EXT OFFICE 316 E. Oxford
GOODWELL	OKLA PANHANDLE RESEARCH & EXT CENTER Rt. 1 Box 86M
HOBART	KIOWA CO. FAIRGROUNDS Exhibit Building
LAWTON	GREAT PLAINS COLISEUM Annex Rm 920 S. Sheridan Rd.
McALESTER	KIAMICHI TECH CENTER on HWY 270 W of HWY 69
OKC	OKLA CO. EXT 930 N. Portland, Auditorium - <u>Park & enter</u> from the North side
TULSA	NE CAMPUS OF TCC 3727 E. Apache (Apache & Harvard) Engineering Tech Rm. 127

If you have any questions, please call (405) 522-5950 or e-mail
eva.landeros@oda.state.ok.us

**Testing will begin at 9:00 am. NO NEW APPLICANTS WILL BE ACCEPTED AFTER
11 AM.**

ALL TESTS must be completed by 1:00 pm

2009 Test Sessions

MAY		SEPTEMBER	
4	OKC	3	ALTUS
14	TULSA	10	TULSA
18	OKC	14	OKC
28	TULSA	17	TULSA
		28	OKC

JUNE		OCTOBER	
2	GOODWEL	1	HOBART
11	TULSA	8	TULSA
15	OKC	12	OKC
25	TULSA	19	ALTUS
25	ENID	22	TULSA
		26	OKC

JULY		NOVEMBER	
6	OKC	3	GOODWELL
9	TULSA	5	TULSA
20	OKC	5	HOBART
23	TULSA	5	OKC
		12	LAWTON
		19	TULSA
		23	OKC

APRIL		AUGUST		DECEMBER	
6	OKC	10	OKC	3	TULSA
9	TULSA	13	TULSA	7	OKC
15	LAWTON	27	TULSA	10	ENID
20	OKC	27	ENID	17	TULSA
23	TULSA	31	OKC	28	OKC

OPPORTUNITIES TO EARN CEU'S

APRIL 2, 2009

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 5
CATEGORY: 7b – STRUCTURAL
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 8 – PUBLIC HEALTH
CATEGORY: 4
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 7
SPONSOR: UNIVAR
TOPIC: ANNUAL TRAINING SEMINAR
PLACE: CLARION MOTEL
BROKEN ARROW, OK
CONTACT: DEB CHAMBERS
918.251.4868
FEE: YES

APRIL 22-24, 2009

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 2
SPONSOR: PCT
TOPIC: THE GREEN PEST MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
PLACE: IRVING, TX
CONTACT: LOLA PEREZ WENHAM
330.523.5369
FEE: YES

APRIL 23, 2009

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 7c – FUMIGATION
CEU'S: 5
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 5
SPONSOR: DEGESCH
TOPIC: FUMIGATION RECERTIFICATION
PLACE: STAUNTON, VA
CONTACT: SUSAN NICHOLS
540.234.9281
FEE: YES

APRIL 23, 2009

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 7
CATEGORY: 7c – FUMIGATION
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 7
SPONSOR: IFC
TOPIC: RECERTIFICATION SEMINAR
PLACE: LITTLE ROCK, AR
CONTACT: PAUL LAUGHLIN
FEE: YES

JULY 11-14, 2009

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 3b – INTERIOSCAPE
CEU'S: 5
CATEGORY: 3c – NURSERY/GREENHOUSE
CEU'S: 7
CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 7
SPONSOR: OHIO FLORICULTURE ASSOCIATION
TOPIC: GREENHOUSE/INTERIOSCAPE PEST MANAGEMENT
PLACE: COLUMBUS, OH
CONTACT: MICHELLE MAZZA
614.487.1117
FEE: YES

AUGUST 18, 2009

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 10
CATEGORY: 7c – FUMIGATION
CEU'S: 5
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 7
SPONSOR: IFC
TOPIC: AIB/FISA RECERTIFICATION SEMINAR
PLACE: KANSAS CITY, KS
CONTACT: PAUL LAUGHLIN
FEE: YES

ONGOING

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 4
CATEGORY: 10 - DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 4
SPONSOR: UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
TOPIC: PRINCIPLES OF TURFGRASS MANAGEMENT
PLACE: CORRESPONDENCE COURSE
CONTACT: PHYLISS BREWER
706.542.6692
FEE: YES

ONGOING

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 2
CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 7b - STRUCTURAL
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 10 - DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 6
CATEGORY: ALL CATEGORIES
CEU'S: 2
SPONSOR: CHRYSALIS EDUCATION & CONSULTING
TOPIC: O&T, GENERAL PEST & STRUCTURAL
PLACE: HOLIDAY INN
CONTACT: 3101 N. DALLAS PKW
PLANO, TX
DENNIS MALONEY
806.468.8583
FEE: YES

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: VARIOUS
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: UNIVAR
TOPIC: VARIOUS
PLACE: INTERNET – WWW.PESTWEB.COM
CONTACT: JEFF SMITH
916.371.7602
FEE: NO

ONGOING

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 8 – PUBLIC HEALTH
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 10 - DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: UNIVAR
TOPIC: A QUIET TICKING
PLACE: PESTWEB WWW.PESTWEB.COM
CONTACT: JEFF SMITH
JEFF.SMITH@UNIVARUSA.COM
FEE: NO

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: UNIVAR
TOPIC: WEED CONTROL – THE HERBICIDES #604
PLACE: INTERNET – WWW.PESTWEB.COM
CONTACT: JEFF SMITH
916.371.7602
FEE: NO

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: UNIVAR
TOPIC: GOING GREEN & ORGANIC #207
PLACE: INTERNET – WWW.PESTWEB.COM
CONTACT: JEFF SMITH
916.371.7602
FEE: NO

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 3
CATEGORY: 7b - STRUCTURAL
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: WHITMIRE MICRO-GEN
TOPIC: PRESCRIPTION TREATMENT UNIVERSITY
PLACE: WHITMIRE WEB SITE
CONTACT: JODI WILSON
880.777.8570
FEE: YES

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: VARIOUS
CEU'S: VARIOUS
SPONSOR: PEST NETWORK
TOPIC: VARIOUS
PLACE: PESTNETWORK.COM
CONTACT: MEL YELL
512.626.1645 CELL
FEE: YES

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: 1a – AGRICULTURAL PLANT
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: Pest Network
TOPIC: GREENBUG MANAGEMENT
PLACE: www.pestnetwork.com
CONTACT: CHARLES COLE
979.732.0501
FEE: YES

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: 1a – AGRICULTURAL PLANT
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: SOUTHWEST FARM PRESS
TOPIC: WEED RESISTANCE MANAGEMENT IN COTTON
PLACE: INTERNET – WWW.SOUTHWESTFARMPRESS.COM
CONTACT: CHERYL OGLE
559.322.6558
FEE: NO

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: 1a – AGRICULTURAL PLANT
CEU'S: 1
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: SOUTHWEST FARM PRESS
TOPIC: SPRAY DRIFT MANAGEMENT
PLACE: WWW.SOUTHWESTFARMPRESS.COM
CONTACT: HARRY CLINE
512.288.8288
FEE: YES

ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY: VARIOUS
CEU'S: VARIOUS
SPONSOR: UNIVAR
TOPIC: VARIOUS – GENERAL PEST CONTROL
PLACE: [HTTP://WWW.PESTWEB.COM](http://www.pestweb.com)
CONTACT: VIC PRRALEZ
888.755.5566
FEE: YES

The information given herein is for educational purposes only. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Cooperative Extension Service is implied. Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension service does not discriminate in its programs and activities because of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability, or status as a veteran. This publication is printed and issued by Oklahoma State University as authorized by the Dean of the Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and has been prepared and distributed at a cost of \$250 for 500 copies.