

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University
<http://pested.okstate.edu>



MAY 2010

CHEM

Table of Contents

Phosphine Label Changes	1
EPA Wants Enforcement Blitz	2
EPA's Proposed Drift Labeling	3
Buffer Zones Not Enough	3
Court Reviews Permit Dispute	4
USDA OIG Criticizes NOP	5
Registration Review	5
Methidathion Cancellation	6
MSMA Cancellations	6
More on Furadan	6
Pesticides on Food	9
Pesticides & Bees	9
Consequences of Biotech Corn	9
Soil Fumigants	9
Austria Withdraws Study on Fertility	9
Consequences of Biotech Corn	
Endangered Species	10
Pirimicarb Cancellation	10
Maneb Cancellation	10
Methyl Parathion Cancellations	10
Testing Dates & Locations	11
CEU's	13

PHOSPHINE CHANGES

Due to the misuse of phosphine in Utah that killed two young children, EPA has tightened the restriction on aluminum and magnesium phosphide uses.

Use in residential areas for burrowing pests (moles and gophers) is removed from the labels.

The buffer zone from building that may be occupied by humans or domestic animals is increased to 100 feet.

We asked for clarification of "buildings that may be occupied by humans or domestic animals". We used an example of

a park or recreation area with a building that is occupied for two (2) hours per month and

asked if the 100 foot buffer zone applied. Michael Hardy, Special Assistant to the Deputy Office Director of Office of Pesticide Programs, replied in an e-mail that, yes the 100 foot buffer zone would apply in such a situation.

EPA has been working with Degesch (the major registrant) on these label changes. EPA informed OSU PSEP that EPA would be contacting the other registrants for these new label changes.

As it stands now, use of existing stock can be used according to label directions.

OSU PSEP recommends that those using phosphine fumigant in residential settings change to other methods for controlling burrowing pests.

The label changes are:

- Use is strictly prohibited around all residential areas, including single and multi-family residential properties, nursing homes, schools (except athletic fields, where use may continue), day care facilities, and hospitals.
- Products must only be used outdoors for control of burrowing pests, and are for use only on agricultural areas, orchards, non-crop areas (such as pasture and rangeland), golf courses, athletic fields, parks and recreational areas, cemeteries, airports, rights-of-

way, earthen dams, and other non-residential, institutional or industrial areas.

- Products must not be applied in a burrow system that is within 100 feet of a building that is or may be occupied by people or domestic animals. This buffer zone for treatment around non-residential buildings that could be occupied by people or animals has been increased from 15 feet to 100 feet.
- When this product is used in athletic fields or parks, the applicator must post a sign at entrances to the treated site containing the signal word DANGER/PELIGRO, skull and crossbones, the words: DO NOT ENTER/NO ENTRE, FIELD NOT FOR USE, the name and EPA registration number of the fumigant, and a 24-hour emergency response number. Signs may be removed 2 days after the final treatment. EPA says this is a 48 hour reentry interval.
- When this product is used out-of-doors in a site frequented by people, other than an athletic field or park, the applicator shall post a sign at the application site containing the signal word DANGER/PELIGRO, skull and crossbones, the name and EPA registration number of the fumigant, and a 24-hour emergency response number. Signs may be removed 2 days after the final treatment. EPA says this is a 48 hour reentry interval.
- Fumigant Management Plans must be written before all applications of phosphine products, including all burrowing pest fumigations. A Fumigant Management Plan is a written description of the steps designed to plan for a safe, legal and effective fumigation. The certified applicator and owner of the property to be fumigated must characterize

the area to be treated and include all safety requirements in the plan before application. (**Note:** This is not new and has been required for years.)

(AAPSE e-mail, April 7, 2010, OSU PSEP)

EPA WANTS ENFORCEMENT BLITZ

Adam Kushner, head of civil enforcement at EPA, told state lead agency personnel that despite pesticide-specific priorities being considered in a draft but ultimately dropped from EPA's National Enforcement Initiatives for fiscal 2011-13, EPA is calling for stricter enforcement, higher penalties and "blitzes" by federal agents to clamp down on pesticide companies and registered users at a "wholesale" level.

"It's definitely a different direction the wind is blowing," reacted Tim Creger, American Association of Pesticide Control Officials said.

To bolster EPA, Administrator Lisa Jackson's and President Obama committed \$10.5 billion for FY 2010, \$600 million of which is dedicated to enforcement.

"It's remarkable to me the breadth of products, the number of sophisticated companies with shall we say, unsubstantiated claims," Kushner said. "Given the level of activity and the results of some of these cases, our penalties have been too low."

Much of the interest in Kushner's address was the repercussions of removing the issues of pesticides at day care facilities and agricultural worker protections from the draft list of EPA National Enforcement Priorities. Kushner stressed there is room for the issues to be pursued vigorously via alternate avenues.

"Pesticide work was not selected as a [priority] enforcement initiative recently, but

that's only a small piece of our work," he said.

When EPA listed the two pesticide-related issues in the draft enforcement priorities several government and industry groups pushed back.

Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment sent a letter that called for the removal of the daycare priority based on EPA studies that showed only "miniscule concentrations" of pesticides.

The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services in a similar letter criticized the EPA's use of "anecdotal evidence" in explaining its priority listing for day care facilities. The letter also stressed the enormous state resources that would be required to abide by the priority.

With regard to worker protection, Kushner said that too many companies were flouting the law in part because penalties were weak, and under served communities had little recourse against violating employers.

"We want to target the misuse, misapplication of pesticides as it relates to worker protection," he said. "We know it's occurring, and it will probably involve several weeks in the field, a 'blitz' if you will of a particular industry, looking for a particular product, a particular use."

"Stay tuned," Kushner warned, promising success in worker protection. "We want to send a big message."

While avoiding references to how they would be financed, Kushner invited states to collaborate with the federal government on goals of shared accountability and strengthened oversight in the area of FIFRA compliance. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38, No 17, March 15, 2010)

EPA'S PROPOSED DRIFT LABELING

Grower and industry groups were highly critical of EPA's proposed guidance for new

pesticide label language meant to reduce drift, arguing the plan will impose sweeping changes that are both unnecessary and confusing.

State agricultural and environmental officials, while welcoming EPA's effort to tackle the issue, are also concerned that some of the language proposed by the agency is ambiguous and worry it could hamper their efforts to limit pesticide drift and carry out their compliance and enforcement obligations.

The labeling statement is "problematic," said Charles Andrews, associate director of the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's Pesticide Programs Division. "We understand the desire to give a reason for avoiding drift, but this labeling statement may require a risk assessment judgment by field enforcers and, based upon our considerable experience in administrative hearings, will unnecessarily complicate completion of successful enforcement action."

State officials raised similar concerns with the suggested label language for consumer products, such as those used on lawns and gardens. EPA's draft PR suggests a label that warns against applications that result in spray or drift that "could cause harm to people, pets, property, aquatic life, wildlife, or wildlife habitat."

The use of "harm" in such context is vague and troubling, several officials noted, as it could be defined as the mere detection of pesticide products off site when no adverse effect is observed or appropriate benchmark exceeded. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38, No 17, March 15, 2010)

BUFFER ZONES NOT ENOUGH

Buffer zones requested by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in a petition submitted to EPA last October to

protect children in rural, farming communities from pesticide drift are inadequate, the groups contend.

“These buffer zones are actually generally under-protective andfor many organophosphate and carbamate pesticides substantially larger buffer zones are needed and supportable,” the groups commented.

The petition was filed by Earthjustice and Farmworker Justice on behalf of eight groups, including Pesticide Action Network North America, Untied Farm Workers and Physicians for Social Responsibility.

The petition asserts that by failing to impose rules to protect children from drift-both spray drift and volatilization-EPA has not fully met its obligations under FQPA to set standards by 2006 to protect children from aggregate exposures to pesticides.

“The interim emergency default buffer zones requested in the petition...are very minimal and utilize low end estimates of exposure and risk,” the petitioners write in their comments.

The groups calculated buffer zones they felt were adequately protective. Using a risk assessment methodology EPA has developed to guide decisions about reducing children’s exposure to drift and five example insecticides the groups note that buffer zones should range from 60 feet to more than 150 feet for ground applications and from 100 feet to more than 1,000 feet for aerial applications.

The groups further note that a buffer zone “should not be measured from the boundary of the treated area to the side of the building of interest (e.g., a school, home or daycare center), but rather it should be measured from the boundary of the treated area to the property line of the site to be protected.” (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38, No 17, March 15, 2010)

COURT REVIEWS PERMIT DISPUTE

The legal battle over a New York county government’s mosquito abatement program took another turn as a three-judge panel of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals vacated a lower court ruling that had dismissed an environmental group’s claims that aerial spraying of pesticides violates the Clean Water Act.

The decision sends the case back to the district court and is a major victory for Peconic Baykeeper.

In 2008, U.S. District Court Judge Arthur D. Spatt ruled that the county’s activities did not require an NPDES permit because of longstanding EPA policy – and its 2006 aquatic pesticides rule – that said pesticides applied in accordance with their FIFRA labels aren’t pollutants under the CWA.

Peconic Baykeeper appealed in January 2009 – the same month the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the EPA aquatic pesticides rule.

Industry groups had hoped the 2nd Circuit might provide a circuit split on the contentious issue of CWA permitting for pesticide applications.

The ruling express “no views on the reasoning” of the 6th Circuit decision, but notes that until the stay is lifted, the application of pesticides in accordance with the 2006 rule is lawful.

“Spraying that occurs prior to expiration of the 6th Circuit’s stay of mandate, and is consistent with the EPA-approved labeling, remains in compliance with the final rule,” according to the decision written by Judge P. Kevin Castel.

Once the stay expires (April 2011), EPA’s “yet-to-be finalized” permitting system will govern the application of pesticides,” Castel explains. “Similarly, because the stay of mandate maintains the status quo, and the EPA has expressed the

intent to establish a nationwide permitting process, injunctive relief is unnecessary to prevent the alleged ongoing or future violations.”

But the court finds Spatt wrongly concluded that all of the county’s pesticide applications were in compliance with FIFRA, highlighting evidence of “aerial spraying over creeks.”

Such spraying “may have been contrary to the relevant FIFRA labeling” of two of the insecticides used by the county, Castel writes, as both forbid direct application over lakes, ponds and streams or areas where surface water is present.

Spatt acknowledged the “existence of evidence” that the county may have sprayed above various creeks, Castel explains, but appears to have ignored it and did not clarify how such spraying conforms with the pesticide’s label instructions.

“Because the district court did not explain the basis of its conclusion that all spraying was in compliance with the FIFRA label, the judgment of the district court is vacated insofar as it held that the county’s spraying activities were uniformly in compliance with the FIFRA requirements, and the case is remanded for further fact finding,” Castel wrote. “The district court may, in the exercise of discretion, allow the trial record to be reopened.”

Spratt also erred in ruling that the trucks and helicopters used by the county to spray pesticides were not point sources under the statute, the panel concludes.

“The district court reasoned that because the trucks and helicopters discharged pesticides into the air, any discharge was indirect, and thus not from a point source,” Castel explains. “We disagree.”

The spray apparatus was attached to trucks and helicopters and “was the source of the discharge,” according to the court. “The pesticides were discharged ‘from’ the source, and not from the air.” (Pesticide &

Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 20, April 5, 2010)

USDA OIG CRITICIZES NOP

Although USDA’s National Organic Program (NOP) has made significant improvements in its operations since a 2005 audit by the agency’s Office of Inspector General (OIG), the program is still far from perfect.

OIG says USDA’s Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has made improvements since 2005, implementing corrective actions for eight of the 10 recommendations issued in its prior audit. Relations between the NOP and the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) are better, and NOP officials have restructured their complaint handling process.

“However, we believe that NOP officials need to further improve program administration and strengthen their management controls to ensure more effective enforcement of program requirements when serious violations, including operations that market product as organic while under suspension, are found,” OIG says. “In addition, they need to strengthen their oversight of certifying agents and organic operations to ensure that organic products are consistently and uniformly meeting NOP standards. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38, No 18, March 22, 2010)

REGISTRATION REVIEWS

EPA has opened several registration reviews for public comment by June 1, 2010. We will summarize them below.

Deltamethrin

Tralomethrin breaks down into deltamethrin, so they will be considered

together with deltamethrin dietary covering the tralomethrin studies.

EPA has determined the pyrethroids share a common mechanism of toxicity. This has regulatory impacts through FQPA and the “risk cup”.

Deltamethrin is considered as “not likely to be carcinogenic to humans”.

EPA states the dietary exposure database is adequate to support registration review but will be reviewed.

EPA is requiring an immunotoxicity study and a new drinking water assessment.

One of the major concerns is children exposure to pet flea and tick collars.

Chlorpyrifos-methyl (Reldan)

There is no acceptable environmental fate data for this chemical. However, due to its exclusively indoor use (warehouses and grain bins), EPA has reduced concerns regarding endangered species and out-door environmental effects.

Sodium Bentazon (Basagran)

Existing risk assessments concluded that risks posed by all of the registered uses at the time did not exceed the Agency’s level of concern for fish and aquatic invertebrates. However, the predicted level of risk did exceed the Agency’s level of concern for potential to harm certain threatened and endangered small mammals and birds.

Bentazon is considered very mobile but not persistent in soil for water movement.

Sodium Acifluorfen (Blazer)

EPA intends to require data and conduct an ecological risk assessment including an endangered species assessment. EPA also intends to require additional human health toxicology data. The Agency will be requiring various environmental chemistry studies along with the immunotoxicity study. (Federal Register, March 31, 2010)

METHIDATHION CANCELLATION

Sygenta and Gowan have requested voluntary cancellation of methidathion (Supracide) insecticide.

It is very likely that EPA will accept this request and cancel all uses of methidathion.

There is a comment period until May 7, 2010.

In the proposed cancellation document registrants can sell methidathion until December 31, 2012. Distributors and retailers will be prohibited from selling methidathion on December 31, 2014.

EPA is allowing the use of methidathion until the stocks are exhausted. (Federal Register, April 7, 2010)

MSMA CANCELLATIONS

EPA has received request from registrants to voluntary cancel certain MSMA products. EPA states it will accept this request unless substantive comments are received before May 7, 2010.

The products included are:

Brand Name	EPA Reg. No.
Weed Hoe 120	42750-28
Weed Hoe 108	42750-29
Daconate	61483-13
Daconate 6	61483-14
Bueno-6	61483-15
Daconate Super	
Brand	61483-17
Bueno	61483-18

After December 31, 2010, exiting stocks labeled for all uses, except cotton, sod farms, golf courses, and highway rights-of-way, can be used legally until they are exhausted, provided that such use complies with the EPA-approved label and labeling.

After December 31, 2013, use of MSMA products labeled for use on sod farms, golf courses, and highway rights-of-way, is prohibited. (Federal Register, April 7, 2010)

MORE ON FURADAN

Three federal appeals court judges hearing oral arguments for and against an evidentiary hearing to support EPA's revocation of carbofuran tolerances expressed particular interest in EPA's usage estimates and why the agency revoked import tolerances, which do not impact U.S. environmental quality.

At issue was EPA's decision to revoke all domestic and import tolerances for carbofuran and to deny a subsequent request by FMC for an evidentiary hearing under Section 408 of the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

The agency maintains that it determined "after a lengthy administrative process involving multiple opportunities for public participation and an independent peer review" that adults and children whose drinking water comes from sources vulnerable to carbofuran contamination are exposed to unsafe aggregate food and water levels of the insecticide, which causes acetylcholinesterase inhibition, or a disruption in the ability of the nervous system to communicate chemically with muscles and glands.

In its written arguments, EPA said FMC's objections to the revocation and request for a hearing were "substantially premised" on an application FMC filed to amend its FIFRA registration after the date of the tolerance revocation and that "an objection based on actions occurring after the [tolerance revocation] rule's promulgation is inconsistent with the FFDCA" and not resolvable through a hearing.

The petitioners counter that EPA violated FFDCA and its own regulations by refusing to allow an evidentiary hearing before a "neutral fact finder" to resolve disagreements over what they claim are obvious material factual issues involving carbofuran's safety assessment. Specifically, they cite:

- A dispute over potential surface water concentrations (1.1 ppb versus 36.7 ppb) driven by EPA's "exaggerate" assumption that 100% of the crops in any watershed would be treated;
- A dispute over potential groundwater concentrations (1.1 ppb versus 16 ppb) driven by a disagreement as to whether carbofuran will be applied in areas "vulnerable" to leaching;
- A dispute over half-life value based in turn on the dispute as to whether drinking water concentrations will exceed 1.1 ppb; and
- Disputes surrounding the "safety factors" that should be applied when calculating the safe dose (EPA has applied a 4X FQPA safety factor and 10X interspecies safety factor, while petitioners say those factors should be 1X and 3X, respectively).

Judge Griffin began oral arguments by telling petitioners' counsel Kenneth Weinstein that the case involves "matters of tremendous complexity" and that "normally a great sense of deference is given to agencies when making a decision."

Weinstein stressed that the court should assess the record without any particular deference to EPA and determine whether it supports EPA's denial of a hearing and, if it does not, declare the agency's decision unlawful. Unlike challenges brought under the Administrative Procedure Act, where an agency's actions must be found to be arbitrary and capricious to be thrown out, the petitioners' challenge is being brought under FFDCA, and thus the court must only determine that an impartial third party would flag legitimate disagreements over fact, Weinstein pointed out.

Judge Tatel asked Weinstein to address EPA's position that there were no grounds for granting an evidentiary hearing because the petitioners' request "simply recycles your comments – you're not actually

challenging the final rule.” Weinstein replied by accusing the agency of having created “a Catch-22” that enabled it to dismiss all petitioners’ arguments as “Too early” or “too late” to warrant a hearing.

“To the extent we relied on what was in our comments, EPA said you can’t repeat your comment,” Weinstein said. “If we tried to say something new, EPA said you can’t do that, it’s outside the comment period.”

When asked by the judges to address EPA’s allegation that the petitioners’ had proposed modifying use patterns on carbofuran’s label under FIFRA, which would leave the matter outside the jurisdiction of FFDCA and thus not ripe for an evidentiary hearing, Weinstein argued that “EPA has to consider a less restrictive alternative than a ban” and that petitioners had “submitted expert comment that [a FIFRA label change] is a feasible alternative.”

The judges also asked Weinberg (EPA) to expound on the petitioners’ reliance on a leaching study they compiled based on expert evaluation of 64,000 site-specific combinations of soil and weather characteristics drawn from nationally recognized databases maintained by government agencies. Weinberg said the report constitutes evidence of a legitimate factual dispute between petitioners and EPA.

Alan Greenberg, an attorney with the Department of Justice representing EPA, faced heavy questioning about the agency’s assumption in its safety assessment that there would be 100% crop treatment in a given year – particularly in light of petitioners’ estimation, based on sales data, that no more than 4% of crops would be treated.

Greenberg, who said EPA considered petitioner’s sales data even though it arrived after the comment period, said the agency had determined there was too much variability in usage and pest infestation each

year for the data to apply. He also said EPA was accounting for a situation in which “use could exceed sales if farmers held on to product and used it the next year” along with newly purchased supplies. Judge Ginsburg said the actions of a few “profligate farmers” could not account for the difference between estimates of 4% and 100%.

“Why is it reasonable that just because something is permissible, it will happen, even though it’s never happened before and would be remarkable if it did happen?” Ginsburg asked Greenberg, to which Greenberg replied, “We don’t know it hasn’t happened.”

Ginsburg asked Greenberg to account for EPA’s revocation of import tolerances, noting that EPA has determined these are safe. “I fail to see the logic in rejecting [them],” he said.

Greenberg said petitioners’ request to keep them “was not timely” having been raised after the comment period. He said they could be allowed if petitioners agreed they would not seek domestic uses.

“Is this some sort of a plea bargain?” Ginsburg asked. “If they say they want import tolerances and the import tolerances are safe, you’ll say you can’t have them unless you give up domestic uses?”

“Yes,” Greenberg said, adding that “the primary basis for rejecting [import tolerances] was that the basket of uses petitioners requested included domestic uses.”

John Keeling, executive vice president and CEO of the National Potato Council, said the case extends beyond carbofuran itself, which is a “niche” product growers use partly to prevent newer preferred chemistries from waning in efficacy.

“Using a tolerance revocation” – as opposed to the product cancellation process laid out in FIFRA Section 6 – “is bad policy,” he says. “Once you [ban a product] through tolerance revocation, the benefits of

the product don't count and the user groups aren't taken into consideration. It's faster and quicker for the agency, but it's a backwards way to go at it." (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 19, March 29, 2010)

PESTICIDES ON FOOD

USDA has released its 2008 PDP survey. They took 11,960 samples of fresh and processed fruit and vegetables, almonds, honey, corn grain, and rice. Only 1.6% of the samples had residue detection.

The percentage of samples exceeding tolerance was 0.5% and 3.7% of the samples had residue for pesticides that did not have a tolerance.

They also conducted groundwater tests. Forty-four percent of the samples had one or more pesticides detected at the ppt level. Over 99% of the samples did not exceed tolerance for groundwater.

PESTICIDES AND BEES

University of Pennsylvania, USDA and Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture researchers have found honey bees across North America are extensively exposed to pesticides.

They tested nearly 900 samples of wax, pollen, hives and bees, finding nearly 60% of the more than 600 wax and pollen samples contained at least one systemic pesticide, with more than 47% of these samples having both the acaricides fluvalinate and coumaphos as well as the fungicide chlorothalonil. Pollen samples contained chlorothalonil levels up to 99 ppm, and other pesticides like aldicarb, chlorpyrifos and imidacloprid were found at 1 ppm levels. Fewer pesticides were found in the bees themselves. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 20, April 5, 2010) (**Note:** Fluvalinate and coumaphos are labeled for use inside bee hives.)

AUSTRIA WITHDRAWS STUDY ON FERTILITY CONSEQUENCES OF BIOTECH CORN

Austria has withdrawn a study, published in November 2008 that found mice fed genetically engineered corn gave birth to fewer offspring.

The study, carried out by a working group at the University of Vienna under the leadership of Jürgen Zentek fed their experimental mice a diet consisting of one third biotech corn from the NK603-MON810 cross. A control group received conventional corn. In another experiment, mice were fed over four generations with both diets. In the evaluation of the long-term study published at that time, the number of offspring in the third and fourth litters were less than for the control group fed with conventional feed. Although Zentek warned about hasty generalizations, since then, the study has been consistently cited by biotech opponents as evidence of health risks through genetically engineered food plants.

Subsequently, Austria introduced the study into the consultation at the EU level as "part of comprehensive efforts of the Austrian government regarding the safety of GM plants," according to *GMO Compass*. However, Austria was apparently unable to provide either these data or a statistically correct evaluation. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 20, April 5, 2010)

SOIL FUMIGANTS

At a meeting of state lead agencies and EPA, the status of soil fumigants was discussed.

EPA stated that label changes that are to already be in place include, RUP for metam and dazomet, best management practices, rate reduction, etc. However, there are no

new labels with these requirements available and according to EPA will not be available until December 2010.

Fumigation management plan examples can be found at http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/soil_fumigants/index.htm.

Registrants are required to do the training but no registrant has submitted training for approval to EPA.

Simply stated, EPA told the states they must enforce the requirements without having seen a label and without the required training having taken place. (SIFREG-POM Minutes)

ENDANGERED SPECIES

At the SFIREG-POM meeting, Arty Williams with EPA discussed the status of Bulletins Live and EPA's endangered species Risk Mitigation Measures (RM) program.

EPA will use Bulletins Live to implement the endangered species requirements in the Pacific Northwest. Buffers will be based on droplet size, water body size, wind speed, soil moisture, weather conditions, and fish mortality reports. They will apply to intermittent streams, drainage ditches, canals, and off channel habitat. The buffer zones will apply even when no water is present.

Steve Foss with Washington Department of Agriculture displayed the impacts of the buffer zones. With 1,000 foot buffers, one county lost 75% of its agricultural production area. (SFIREG-POM Minutes)

PIRIMICARB CANCELLATION

EPA has received a voluntary request to cancel Pirimidor insecticide. This would effectively remove this product from the market.

Existing stocks can be used according to label direction. (Federal Register, April 21, 2010)

MANEB CANCELLATION

EPA has accepted the voluntary cancellation of the last registration for maneb fungicide.

Existing stocks can be used according to label directions. (Federal Register, April 16, 2010)

METHYL PARATHION CANCELLATIONS

EPA has received a voluntary request for the cancellation of methyl parathion on alfalfa, barley, canola/rapeseed, corn, cotton, grass (forage), oats, rye, soybeans, sunflowers, and wheat. This would end the last labeled methyl parathion uses on these crops.

EPA is accepting comment until May 28, 2010. They can be submitted to <http://www.regulations.gov> and enter EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0332 in the search box. (Federal Register, April 28, 2010)



Jim T Criswell
Pesticide Coordinator

PESTICIDE APPLICATOR TEST SESSIONS 2010

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

2010 Test Sessions

MAY		AUGUST		NOVEMBER	
6	TULSA	9	OKC	2	GOODWELL
10	OKC	12	TULSA	4	TULSA
20	ENID	23	OKC	8	OKC
24	OKC	26	TULSA	10	HOBART
27	TULSA			18	TULSA
				22	OKC

JUNE		SEPTEMBER		DECEMBER	
1	GOODWELL	1	ALTUS	1	LAWTON
7	OKC	2	ENID	2	TULSA
10	TULSA	9	TULSA	7	GOODWELL
24	TULSA	13	OKC	9	ENID
		27	OKC	13	OKC
		30	TULSA	16	TULSA

JULY		OCTOBER	
8	TULSA	4	OKC
12	OKC	6	HOBART
22	TULSA	13	ALTUS
26	OKC	14	TULSA
		25	OKC
		28	TULSA

OPPORTUNITIES TO EARN CEU'S

MAY 11, 2010

CATEGORY: 8 – PUBLIC HEALTH
CEU'S: 3
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 3
SPONSOR: PUBLIC HEALTH EQUIPMENT & SUPPLY
TOPIC: CEU WORKSHOP
PLACE: BROKEN ARROW, OK
CONTACT: CHARLES REEVES
800.284.0106
FEE: YES

AUGUST 10, 2010

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 8
CATEGORY: 7c – FUMIGATION
CEU'S: 4
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 8
CATEGORY: 11 – BIRD & PREDATORY ANIMAL
CEU'S: 2
SPONSOR: FOOD INDUSTRY SANITATION AUDITORS
TOPIC: AIB/FISA RECERTIFICATION SEMINAR
PLACE: MARRIOTT KANSAS CITY AIRPORT
KANSAS CITY, MO
CONTACT: PAUL LAUGHLIN
913.782.6399
FEE: YES

AUGUST 11, 2010

CATEGORY: 7a – GENERAL PEST
CEU'S: 5
CATEGORY: 7c – FUMIGATION
CEU'S: 3
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 5
SPONSOR: FOOD INDUSTRY SANITATION AUDITORS
TOPIC: AIB/FISA RECERTIFICATION SEMINAR
PLACE: MARRIOTT KANSAS CITY AIRPORT
KANSAS CITY, MO
CONTACT: PAUL LAUGHLIN
913.782.6399
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: 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: 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: 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: 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: 1 – ALL CATEGORIES
CEU'S: 1
SPONSOR: GREEN APPLICATOR
TOPIC: GENERAL PESTICIDE INFORMATION
PLACE: WWW.GREENAPPLICATOR.COM
CONTACT: TOM GRAUS
307.203.2736
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 400 copies.