

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



JUNE 2010

CHEM

Table of Contents

Enforcement Priorities	1
Methyl Parathion	1
Atrazine	1
New Soil Fumigant Labels	1
Worker Protection Standard	2
Dirty Dozen	2
History	2
Company to Challenge EPA	3
President's Environmental Cancer Report	4
National Ag Health Study	5
Organic vs. Conventional	5
Herbicides Sterilize Weeds	6
NDPES	6
Cancellations	6
WI Railroad Protection Act	6
Evanston, IL Reduces Pesticide Use	6
Ops Linked to ADHD	7
Retirement	7
Testing Dates & Locations	8
CEU's	10

ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES

EPA has a national focus on the Worker Protection Standard. EPA wants states to increase their inspections and EPA is wanting fines to increase.

EPA's main concern is for migrant workers and EPA has a hard time understanding that many states have very few migrant workers.

In a similar manner, EPA is wanting states to increase their inspections on fumigations – mainly soil fumigation. Since Oklahoma has few soil fumigations, ODAFF

may have to inspect grain fumigations to meet EPA demands. (OSU PSEP).

METHYL PARATHION

As reported last month the registrants for methyl parathion have requested voluntary cancellation of all their products and the technical ingredient. This will cancel all registrations for methyl parathion in the U.S.

Along with this is a proposed end use date for those having methyl parathion. That date will be December 31, 2013. After December 31, 2013, no one can legally use methyl parathion.

ATRAZINE

Representative Keith Ellison (D-MN) introduced a bill (H.R. 5124) “to prohibit the use, production, sale, importation, or exportation of any pesticide containing atrazine.”

The measure has been referred to the House Energy & Commerce, Ways & Means, Foreign Affairs & Agriculture committees. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 23, April 26, 2010)

NEW SOIL FUMIGANT LABELS

At the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee meeting, Richard Keigwin, director of the Pesticide Re-evaluation

Division, said EPA approved all the labels submitted by registrants of methyl bromide, chloropicrin, metam sodium, metam potassium and dazomet to meet the first phase of mitigation requirements.

These include reduction in use rates, limiting use sites, additional PPE, the beginning of handler training and the initiation of fumigation management plans. The second phase is focused on community outreach programs, final fumigant management plans and buffer zones.

EPA initially planned to have the first phase completed by the end of 2009.

State regulatory agencies are to receive the new labels in four to six months. SLAs will have three to four months to review the labels and query EPA with any questions.

EPA intends to hold monthly conference calls with stakeholders to identify any issues coming up in the state agency review and approval process so they can be addressed in real time. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 24, May 3, 2010) **Note:** ODAFF may be on the conference calls but Oklahoma is not considered a major user of soil fumigants and has to this time not been included in requests for comments.

WORKER PROTECTION STANDARD

Bill Diamond, OPP, said EPA is going through the process for proposing changes to the Agricultural Worker Protection Standard and is in the middle of drafting preamble and regulatory language. It is also conducting required economic and procedural analyses as well as required consultations, for example with Native American tribes.

Diamond said EPA expects to issue a proposed rule in late 2011. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 24, May 3, 2010) **Note:** Many labels have WPS statements on non-agricultural products. EPA has stated in the past EPA wants to

include right-of-way, lawncare and pest control under WPS.

DIRTY DOZEN

The Environmental Working Group has issued its dirty dozen list for foods with pesticide residues. Below is a table with their list and USDA's Pesticide Data Program that samples fruits and vegetables for pesticide residue. The USDA PDP is the data base EPA uses in EPA's risk assessments.

Crop	EWG # Detected	USDA # Detected	% with Residue Detected	% Imported
Celery	64	54	3.2	2.6
Peaches	62	52	2.7	31.2
Strawberries	59	46	3.3	9.9
Blueberries	52	46	1.4	52
Nectarines		30	2.9	31.5

You will note there is a difference in the number of detections and the percent of the samples that had one or more pesticide present. (EWG and USDA – PDP, 2008)

HISTORY

While cleaning out file cabinets, I came across an update from ODAFF in 1990. Three items caught my eye. First was the number of agricultural complaints were more than they have been the past few years but not by much. The second was the number of structural complaints. The structural complaints were well above what they have been in the past few years, however, one of the causes remains the same – pretreatments. Today as then, applicators in the Structural category were having a hard time putting the correct amount of termiticide in the tank and doing a proper pretreatment. The third item was ODAFF's plea for agricultural applicators to be aware of their neighbors and not to spray in high winds. (OSU PSEP)

COMPANY READY TO CHALLENGE EPA

Reckitt Benckiser, a rodenticide company, is challenging EPA on the agencies effort to effectively ban legally registered pesticides by threatening enforcement actions rather than pursuing cancellation of the affected products through FIFRA.

Reckitt Benckiser contends EPA is attempting an end-run around FIFRA “while indefinitely delaying and ultimately denying” it the right to the administrative hearing and other procedures the statute affords it before registered products are removed from the market.

The concern is one that resonates beyond just Reckitt Benckiser and there is “much sympathy” across the industry for the company’s complaint, according to John Conner, partner with McKenna Long & Aldridge.

“EPA has devised a myriad of not so subtle ways, often in the context of re-registering or reviewing a pesticide or an active ingredient, to remove, threaten to remove or cajole a product from the market without ever providing the registrant its due process cancellation rights under FIFRA Section 6,” Conner said.

The issue has been a lingering concern for the industry, says Conner, who is not involved in the Reckitt Benckiser case.

“It’s been so long [since] EPA held a cancellation hearing, that anyone who participated in one is likely to recall the Watergate hearings with equal clarity,” he adds.

The roots of the dispute lie with a risk mitigation decision (RMD) EPA issued in May 2008 for 10 rodenticides, including the active ingredients in the company’s d-CON products. The RMD amended the 1998 reregistration eligibility decision (REDs) for the rodenticides and listed certain measures manufactures must take to reduce risks –

including new packaging for residential products as well as a ban on the sale of some more toxic rodenticides to residential consumers.

EPA sent a letter in June 2008 to the affected registrants, advising them that all products that do not comply must be amended or cancelled.

Registrants who did not intend to amend the registrations were told by EPA to submit a voluntary request for cancellation – otherwise the agency would initiate cancellation actions.

EPA set June 4, 2011 as the date by which any voluntary cancellations must be effective and warned it would consider products not in compliance misbranded.

Although several manufacturers notified the agency of their intent to comply with the RMD, Reckitt told EPA it would not amend its registrations and asked the agency to commence the administrative process to cancel the affected rodenticides – that process gives a registrant the right to challenge the agency’s decision before an administrative law judge.

EPA declined to do so, prompting Reckitt Benckiser to file suit in district court. The company argued that once the agency decided that certain active ingredients in rodenticides would be ineligible for reregistration, FIFRA required it to begin a Section 6 cancellation proceeding.

In October 2009, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia granted EPA’s motion to dismiss the case, ruling that jurisdiction lies with the circuit court as the claims center on EPA failing to take actions under FIFRA.

Reckitt subsequently filed an appeal with the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals – as well as a petition for review, in case the court concludes it has jurisdiction over the company’s claims.

At the heart of the matter is whether EPA’ threat to enforce FIFRA’s

misbranding provisions against Reckitt Benckiser's products constitutes a final and binding action.

EPA says it does not, explaining that it "did not cancel any rodenticide registrations, interpret FIFRA's definitions of 'misbranded' in any new or binding way" or commence any misbranding action.

"EPA has presently done nothing to stop the sale of any rodenticide here at issue," the agency writes in its legal brief.

EPA contends that "to merit any relief" the company must identify either some action that FIFRA requires, but that the agency refuses to take, or some action that FIFRA prohibits but that EPA has taken anyway.

"The company cannot do either of these things," EPA argues, explaining that FIFRA gives it the discretion to choose what regulatory action is most appropriate to implement the RMD.

"This court should let EPA, not Reckitt, determine when and how the agency takes action against Reckitt's products," the agency concludes.

Furthermore, the agency cannot deprive Reckitt Benckiser of cancellation hearings until and unless it changes the terms of the company's product registrations, the agency explains.

"At present EPA has merely warned that it might exercise its pre-existing enforcement authority against certain rodenticide products described" in the RMD, according to the agency. "The court cannot review that warning or a hypothetical future misbranding action now, let alone set them aside as 'unlawful.'"

The RMD uses mandatory language more than 90 times and calls for more than 50 separate product design, packaging and labeling changes, with "strict deadlines" by which those changes must be made, according to Reckitt Benckiser.

"EPA declares not once, not twice, but three times that products not conforming to

the RMD cannot lawfully be sold," the company says in its brief. "It's inconceivable that such declarations were not intended to affect the actions and decisions of registrants, to compel compliance, and to remove Reckitt Benckiser's rodenticides from the consumer marketplace.

Two fellow rodenticide manufacturers – Liphatech and Woodstream Corporation – have filed an amicus brief in support of Reckitt Benckiser, arguing that EPA's actions run afoul of FIFRA and are ripe for review by the court.

CropLife America and Responsible Industries for a Sound Environment filed an amicus brief in the district court, but did not file one with the appellate court.

"We chose to sit out the appeal due to product specific issues," Says Joshua Saltzman, assistant general counsel for CropLife. "However, the underlying issue discussed by our amicus brief is that EPA should not be permitted to violate the due process of a registrant by unilaterally cancelling a product's registration without fulfilling its obligations under FIFRA." (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No23, April 26, 2010)

PRESIDENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL CANCER REPORT

The report states overall cancer incidence and mortality has continued to decline in recent years. The report states that "the disease continues to devastate the lives of far too many Americans." In 2009 approximately 1.5 million Americans (≈ 0.005%) were diagnosed with cancer and 562,000 (≈ 0.002%) died from cancer. The report goes on to state that many of the chemicals people are exposed to are un- or understudied and largely unregulated. It should be noted that an estimated 41% of

U.S. citizens will be diagnosed with cancer and an estimated 21% will die from cancer.

Among the pictures shown at the front of the document is an aerial application along with black smoke from an industrial smoke stack and a pipe dumping brown fluid into water.

The report says “The entire U.S. population is exposed on a daily basis to numerous agricultural chemicals, some of which also are used in residential and commercial landscaping. Many of these chemicals have known or suspected carcinogenic or endocrine-disrupting properties.”

Among the many recommendations is decreasing exposure to pesticides “...by choosing to the extent possible, food grown without pesticides or chemical fertilizers...”

When addressing exposure to agriculture, the document only refers to migrant workers and their children. (Reducing Environmental Cancer Risk, What We Can Do Now, April 2010) (**Note:** EPA has classified only two pesticides as carcinogenic – arsenic and PVC)

NATIONAL AG HEALTH STUDY

Some of the study results of the National Ag Health study include:

- Prostate cancer risk greater in frequent methyl bromide users
- Farmers with a family history of prostate cancer had increased risk when chlorpyrifos was used
- Some pesticides may increase the risk of colorectal cancer
- Lung cancer rates among NC & IA farmers is about half that of other residents of the two states
- Pesticides, diesel exhaust, solvents may increase wheeze
- Wheeze incidence was higher among farmers who used paraquat, EPTC,

parathion, malathion, and chlorpyrifos.

- Growing up on a farm may benefit respiratory health
- People who applied pesticides more than 400 days in their lifetime had nearly a two-fold increase in the risk of developing Parkinson’s Disease
- Pesticides may increase the risk of diabetes
- The overall mortality rate for farmers is significantly less than other people in NC & IA. Particularly low rates were observed for cardiovascular disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and total cancer.

(National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, May 2010)

ORGANIC vs. CONVENTIONAL

Conventional farming is better for the environment than organic farming when food yields are taken into account.

The two year study by Professor Tim Benton, conservation expert at the University of Leeds, asked which production methods could increase food yields with the least impact on biodiversity.

With UN estimates that production must increase by 70% by 2050 to feed a growing population, experts around the world are desperately searching for the most environmentally friendly options.

In his unprecedented study Benton compared 192 fields on 32 farms in like-for-like conditions and concluded organic farms produced less than half as much food per hectare as ordinary farms.

He added the ‘undoubted environmental benefits’ of organic farming were outweighed by the need to bring more land into production.

“We compared the same crops on the same land and found organic farming was half as productive as conventional methods.

That means it would need twice as much land to produce the same amount of food.

“So despite our results revealing biodiversity was 12% higher on organic farms, that would be negated when new land was brought into production to increase yields to conventional farm levels,” said Benton.

Benton further warned a move to organic farming could increase demand for food from farms around the world with a poor environmental record.

Benton said organic methods did play a useful part of the land management mix for the less productive parts of the UK, but would not solve food security issues.

“Organic farming is undoubtedly good for biodiversity and has a role in our system. But when it comes to feeding the world, it is not the most environmentally friendly option,” said Benton. (Farmers Guardian, May 11, 2010)

HERBICIDES STERILIZE WEEDS

USDA ARS and Dow AgroSciences researchers studied whether growth regulator herbicides like dicamba, picloram and 2,4-D greatly reduced seed production in Japanese brome. When used properly, such herbicides don't harm perennial grasses. They found picloram reduced seed production nearly 100%, with dicamba slightly less effective. 2,4-D was much less effective.

ARS states annual weedy grass seeds only survive in soil 1-2 years so it should only take 1-3 years of growth regulator herbicide treatment to greatly reduce their numbers naturally stored in the soil without harming perennial grasses (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 25, May 10, 2010)

NPDES

EPA on May 4, 2010 sends its draft NPDES Aquatic Pesticides General Permit to the White House Office of Management and Budget for approval. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 38 No 25, May 10, 2010) **Note:** We now wait and see what OMB does to the proposal.

CANCELLATIONS

Nufarm Limited has requested voluntary cancellation of its 2,4-D products (35935-16; 35935-19; 228-123) due to the cost of meeting data call in requirements (35). Persons with Nufarm 2,4-D products can use them according to label directions.

Similarly Bayer and Valent have voluntarily requested cancellation of their resmethrin products due to data call in requirements and having to go through the Endocrine Disrupter Screening Program.

Existing stock can be used according to label directions. (Federal Register, May 19, 2010)

WI RAILROAD PROTECTION ACT

Wisconsin has passed a law that requires railroads to the railroad company to provide workers along the railroad right-of-way information on pesticide applications within 48 hours of the application and provide safety training. (BCPC News, May 17, 2010)

EVANSTON, IL REDUCES PESTICIDE USE

The City of Evanston, IL has passed a resolution to reduce pesticide use on City-owned and leased property. The policy requires City employees, agents and contractors to follow natural lawn care and

“least-toxic IPM” and prohibits high hazards pesticides.

IPM is described in the policy as, “A pest management technique that gives preference to the safest pest control methods and uses conventional chemical pesticides only when no other feasible alternative exists. It addresses the underlying causes of pest problems, and seeks to find effective long-term solutions that emphasize prevention.”

The policy established an IPM Coordinator to oversee policy implementation. Pesticides that are prohibited to be used on City property include:

- EPA known, probable, likely, possible or suspected carcinogens;
- EPA Toxicity Category I & II pesticides (Danger & Warning signal words)
- Chemicals known to the state of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity

(Beyond Pesticides, May 17, 2010)

OPS LINKED TO ADHD

A recent study in the Journal of Pediatrics, states that exposure of children to organophosphate insecticides increases their likelihood of having Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.

The study does not say OP insecticides are the cause but states the data implicates Ops as the possible cause.

The study states that organophosphate insecticides represent 70% of all pesticide use in the U.S. This is also stated in EPA’s *Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage 2000 and 2001 Market Estimates* report. However, even in this report when using EPA’s data for the most commonly used pesticides, organophosphate insecticides represent 6% of the total. CropLife Foundation’s *Pesticide Use in U.S. Crop Production: 2002* report supplies

information that OP use in crops in 2002 would represent 21% of the insecticides use. This does not include herbicide usage.

EPA has commented on this report stating some of the limitations such as a single spot urine sample and the use of a single metabolite. EPA also states the report was conducted while EPA was reviewing the Ops. Since then, OP active ingredient use has decreased 57% and most residential uses have been canceled or voluntarily removed. (Pediatrics, May 17, 2010; CropLife Foundation Pesticides Use in U.S. Crop Production: 2002, May 2006; EPA Pesticide Industry Sales and Usage 2000 and 2001 Market Estimates, May 2004; EPA Pesticide Programs Update, May 21, 2010)

RETIREMENT

After more than 30 years working with pesticide information and education, Jim Criswell will be retiring from Oklahoma State University on June 30, 2010.

I have enjoyed working with most of you and I realize some of you will be elated at this news and I am too.

I wish all of you well.



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

JUNE		AUGUST		OCTOBER	
1	GOODWELL	9	OKC	4	OKC
7	OKC	12	TULSA	6	HOBART
10	TULSA	23	OKC	13	ALTUS
24	TULSA	26	TULSA	14	TULSA
				25	OKC
				28	TULSA

JULY		SEPTEMBER		NOVEMBER	
8	TULSA	1	ALTUS	2	GOODWELL
12	OKC	2	ENID	4	TULSA
22	TULSA	9	TULSA	8	OKC
26	OKC	13	OKC	10	HOBART
		27	OKC	18	TULSA
		30	TULSA	22	OKC

DECEMBER	
1	
2	TULSA
7	GOODWELL
9	ENID
13	OKC
16	TULSA

OPPORTUNITIES TO EARN CEU'S

JULY 20, 2010

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 3
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 3
SPONSOR: LAWN CARE PEST MANAGEMENT
TOPIC: WEED & VERTEBRATE MANAGEMENT UPDATES
PLACE: TULSA COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE
4116 E. 15TH
CONTACT: CHALRES LUPER FOR PROGRAM INFORMATION
405.744.5531
AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCES FOR REGISTRATION
405.744.6489
FEE: YES

JULY 21, 2010

CATEGORY: 3a – ORNAMENTAL & TURF
CEU'S: 3
CATEGORY: 10 – DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
CEU'S: 3
SPONSOR: LAWN CARE PEST MANAGEMENT
TOPIC: WEED & VERTEBRATE MANAGEMENT UPDATES
PLACE: OKLAHOMA COUNTY EXTENSION OFFICE
930 NORTH PORTLAND
CONTACT: CHALRES LUPER FOR PROGRAM INFORMATION
405.744.5531
AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCES FOR REGISTRATION
405.744.6489
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.