

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



December, 2011

CHEM

- 1 Newsletter Renewal
- 1 OSU Last Chance CEU
- 1 Recertification 2011
- 2 January 2012 Practical
- 2 Pesticide Disposal Results
- 2 License Renewals
- 2 Pyrethrins/Pyrethroid Cumulative Risk Assessment
- 3 EPA New Pesticide Chemical Search
- 4 Environmental Groups Seek Stronger Protections for Pesticide Workers
- 5 Syngenta Argues Against Petitions to Ban Atrazine
- 6 EPA Meets Court Deadline for Pesticide General Permit
- 10 In-State CEU
- 10 Online CEU Links
- 11 ODAFF Test Session Dates
- 12 Renewal Form

OSU PSEP LAST CHANCE CEU MEETING FOR 2011

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will have one last chance for applicators in categories 4 Seed Treatment, 5 Aquatic, and 7C Fumigation to earn 3 CEU's for 2011. The meetings will be held December 9th at the Magnuson Hotel and Convention Center in Oklahoma City.

Cost of registration is \$30 by December 6th for. Registration will increase to \$50 after December 6th or on site (if space available). Register online at the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) website at <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm>.

Registration will start at 8:15 and the program will run from 8:30 am to 11:45 pm. This program has been approved by ODAFF for 3 CEUs for all categories. (PSEP)

RECERTIFICATION 2011

Categories 11 Bird and Predatory Animal, 12a Pressure Facility, 12b Groundline Utility Pole and 13 Metam Sodium must recertify by December 31, 2011. Applicators in these categories should check and make sure they have earned the correct amount of Continuing Education Units (CEU) by December 31, 2011. All of these categories need 5 CEUs by the end of 2011. Applicators that do not have enough CEUs to re-certify must take the appropriate category exam before December 31, 2011 to recertify. (PSEP)

NEWS LETTER RENEWAL

It is time to renew your subscription to the *Pesticide Reports* newsletter. To do so, complete the instructions at the end of this edition. Either e-mail or mail your renewal to us. If you do not respond we will have to drop you from the mailing list.

OSU Extension personnel do not have to renew.

JANUARY 2012 PRACTICAL

The first Practical for 2012 has been scheduled for Category 7A General Pest for January 24th in Stillwater. The first scheduled Practical's for Categories 7B Structural and 7C Fumigation will be held in March. The complete 2012 practical schedule can be found at <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm>. (PSEP)

UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTION RESULTS

Collection totals for the Unwanted Pesticide Disposals held in November are listed below. Again it was a very successful year with a total of 102,676 pounds of pesticide material collected from all four locations. A big thanks to Pontotoc County Fairgrounds, and Apache Farmers COOP for hosting the sites.

Ada	17,388 pounds
Apache	21,105 pounds

(PSEP)

ODAFF LICENSE RENEWALS

ODAFF license renewals have been mailed out to pesticide applicator license holders. License renewals should be returned to ODAFF before **December 31, 2011** to avoid any penalties. All applicators working under the license should be listed and sign the appropriate spot on the renewal form. It is also a good time to make sure any new applicators are added to the license.

PYRETHRINS/PYRETHROID CUMULATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT CONFIRMS SAFETY OF CURRENT USES; SUPPORTS CONSIDERATION OF NEW USES

EPA's recently completed cumulative risk assessment indicates that exposures from the many current uses of pyrethrins and pyrethroid insecticides do not pose risk concerns for children or adults. Further, the cumulative assessment supports consideration of registering additional new uses of these pesticides. EPA therefore is issuing this final pyrethrins/pyrethroid cumulative risk assessment and requesting comment, including information that may be used to further refine the assessment. Once the agency completes and approves pyrethroid single chemical assessments, it is likely that new uses of these pesticides will be added, providing tools that may alleviate challenging new pest management situations such as the invasive stink bug and bed bugs.

The use of pyrethrins and the pyrethroids has increased during the past decade with the declining use of organophosphate pesticides, which are more acutely toxic to people and wildlife than the pyrethroids. In 2009, EPA identified the pyrethroid chemicals as having a common mechanism of toxicity and has now completed a human health cumulative risk assessment for all uses of the pyrethrins and pyrethroids.

EPA's screening level cumulative assessment considers all registered uses of pyrethrins and pyrethroids and includes exposure from food, drinking water and residential settings through oral, dermal and inhalation routes of exposure. The agency considers this cumulative risk assessment to be highly conservative because it assumes that

people are going to be exposed to the highest levels of residues in food, water, and in their homes all on the same day. For example, in estimating residential exposure the assessment assumed no dissipation of the chemicals, all individuals were exposed on the day of application, and exposure for each scenario occurred as a result of the pyrethroid with the highest risk estimate registered for that scenario. The assessment also assumed co-occurrence of certain residential scenarios as worst-case situations. Even using these very conservative assumptions that likely overestimate exposure to pyrethrins and pyrethroids, estimated risks to both adults and children are well below the agency's level of concern.

Interested parties are invited to submit comments and input on the Pyrethrins/Pyrethroid Cumulative Risk Assessment by January 9, 2012, to docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0746 at [Regulations.gov](http://www.epa.gov/regulations). The assessment and supporting documents are available in this docket. See also the agency's Assessing Pesticide Cumulative Risk website. (EPA Nov 9 2011)
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2011/pyrethrins.html

NEW PESTICIDE CHEMICAL SEARCH MAKES IT EASIER TO FIND REGULATORY INFORMATION ON PESTICIDES

EPA has released Pesticide Chemical Search, a new Web-based application that will allow users to easy access to chemical-specific information from the Office of Pesticide Programs' website and several other important sources. Pesticide Chemical Search is designed to consolidate information related to pesticide chemicals (active ingredients), making it easier to find related regulatory and scientific information.

The new application collects existing Web pages on specific chemicals on EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs' website and allows users access to this information through a single portal. Users will also be able to quickly find the current status of a chemical and where it is in the review process. Another key feature is the ability to determine if there are any dockets open for public comment for a given chemical.

Other key features of Pesticide Chemical search include:
20,000+ regulatory documents such as fact sheets and REDs
Links to over 800 dockets in Regulations.Gov
Links to important information, including pesticide tolerances in the eCFR
Web services that provide a wide variety and depth of information about a particular chemical
100,000+ chemical synonyms to power the search engine

Pesticide Chemical Search will be expanded to include pesticide product labels and other relevant information in the near future.

Try the new Pesticide Chemical Search tool by visiting www.epa.gov/pesticides/chemicalsearch.

(EPA NOV 17, 2011)
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2011/chemical-srch.html

ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS SEEK STRONGER PROTECTIONS FOR PESTICIDE WORKERS

Earthjustice and Farmworker Justice, on behalf of seven other groups, filed a legal petition with EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson, Nov. 10, laying out the minimum requirements EPA should adopt when proposing new standards to protect agricultural workers from pesticides, which the agency is expected to do early next year.

"As part of the expected revision to the [Worker Protection Standard, WPS] EPA must, at a minimum, bring the protections of the WPS up to the standards that safeguard workers in non-agricultural employment sectors whose safety is overseen by other federal agencies," the petition states. The WPS was last updated in 1995.

The groups maintain that "the largely poor and minority farmworkers who handle pesticides are not adequately protected by the" current WPS. "A large percentage of pesticide handlers who are sickened by exposure are, in fact, complying with the current version of the Worker Protection Standard," they add.

Among the 17 minimum requirements the groups believe EPA should include in its proposed rule to update the WPS are:

- Expansion of training requirements for agricultural workers, including pesticide handlers;
- No-spray buffer zones around fields where farmworkers are present;
- Protections specifically to protect youth workers and workers who are or could be pregnant;
- The creation of a national system to report incidents of pesticide-related illnesses and injuries, and an online database of reported illnesses;
- Inspections to be conducted without advance notice;

- The creation of a confidential system for reporting unsafe working conditions; and
- Improved hazard communication and direct worker notification regarding restricted entry intervals and pesticides they are being exposed to.

The groups assert the revised WPS also must include medical monitoring for agricultural workers and handlers who regularly handle Toxicity Category I and II organophosphate and n-methyl carbamate pesticides "to evaluate whether they are being exposed to high levels of these dangerous chemicals." They claim such monitoring is necessary for EPA to fulfill its duty under FIFRA that use of such pesticides will not cause unreasonable risks to farmworkers.

The groups note that medical monitoring of non-agricultural workers who handle organophosphate and n-methyl carbamate pesticides, such as employees of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, is "routine, recommended, and often mandatory." In addition, existing medical monitoring initiatives for agricultural workers in California and Washington provide a model for similar programs in all states where organophosphate and n-methyl carbamates pesticides are used, they assert.

Finally, the groups maintain that EPA must require the use of engineering controls to reduce exposure to pesticides, including closed mixing and loading systems and enclosed cab equipment with a ventilation system for workers particularly hazardous pesticides via an airblast sprayer attached to a tractor. Such cabs are already in limited use across the country and can "dramatically reduce" pesticide exposure, the groups maintain.

Closed mixing and loading systems for pesticides, which the groups say are in wide use around the country, are preferable to personal protective equipment, the groups note, adding that studies have shown relying on such equipment to ensure protection from pesticides is "inherently inadequate."

Some of the main drawbacks of such equipment are the high body heat levels it can cause when worn by agricultural workers and the lack of availability from employers.

On a broader level, the groups want EPA to move away from the piecemeal approach of imposing restrictions for individual pesticides through labeling mandates toward a more uniform approach of regulating certain categories of pesticides, like organophosphates.

"Many of these are basic protections already afforded non-agricultural workers throughout the country. It is unconscionable that the 1.4 million farmworkers upon whom we all depend continue to be excluded - by federal policy - from basic protections on the job," says Margaret Reeves, senior scientist at Pesticide Action Network North America, one of the groups supporting the petition. (Pesticide & Chemical Policy, November 18 2011, Volume: 39 Issue: 50)

SYNGENTA, FARM GROUPS ARGUE AGAINST PETITION TO BAN ATRAZINE USE

Farm groups and atrazine registrant Syngenta have joined forces to oppose an environmental group's petition to ban the use and production of the popular herbicide, saying the petitioner offers no new evidence of its claims of a health threat to aquatic species.

More than 1,100 submissions, including a mass comment letter from the Center for Biological Diversity with 7,428 identical comments opposing atrazine, were received by EPA before its comment period closed Nov. 14 in relation to a petition submitted in May by Save the Frogs, an international, nonprofit organization formed in 2008 to save amphibians. The petition includes more than 10,000 signatures and summaries of published literature. EPA also has received nearly 50,000 emails from supporters of the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Center for Biological Diversity urging the agency to phase out atrazine use.

Save the Frogs claims that atrazine is an endocrine disruptor that can turn male frogs into females at concentrations as low as 2.5 parts per billion. It causes cancer in laboratory mammals and developmental problems in fish, claims the group, founded by Kerry Kriger, an environmental scientist. The chemical is one of the most commonly detected pesticides in rainwater, groundwater and tapwater in the U.S.

"Frogs and humans share half our DNA, so atrazine can't be good for humans either," says the group, which notes that the pesticide was banned by the European Union in 2004.

But the loss of atrazine would be devastating to agricultural firms in the U.S., where it is one of the most widely used herbicides. Primarily applied to Midwest crops, before and after planting, to control broadleaf and grassy weeds, atrazine is used on more than 50% of corn, 90% of sugar cane and two-thirds of sorghum acreage.

These sectors would be hit hard and the effects would ripple through the food industry if EPA were to ban atrazine, warns Mark Maslyn, executive director of public policy for the American Farm Bureau Federation, in comments submitted Nov. 8.

"No level of economic dependence would matter if atrazine posed a human health or environmental threat," he says. "But the fact remains, as EPA has stated and the science has demonstrated it is safe."

Maslyn, like others in their comment letters, hails the safety and effectiveness of atrazine in battling weeds and securing an abundant food supply. He notes that the high-profile crop protection product has been the subject of 11 Science Advisory Panel reviews in the last decade alone.

The American Sugar Cane League (ASCL), a group that represents Louisiana sugarcane growers and processors, argues that EPA endorsed the safety of atrazine as recently as July 2009. "The conclusions of well documented/real science research should not be changed due to outside influences that are not based on current scientific research," says Windell Jackson, ASCL's senior agronomist.

"What seem to be little tweaks in regulation have a big impact out here in America's farming communities," he says in his Nov. 8 letter. "We are counting on you to uphold the integrity of sound science in the face of pressure from broad-brush activists and other outside influences."

In its short letter, National Corn Growers Association President Garry Niemeyer says more than 6,000 scientific studies over the past 50 years have established atrazine as a safe herbicide for the environment, animal species, and humans. He adds that corn producers who use atrazine engage in no-till farming, a production technique that helps reduce erosion and protect wildlife habitats for frogs.

EPA to revise human health risk assessment

Not surprisingly, the company that manufactures atrazine submitted a 26-page comment letter in defense of the herbicide.

"None of the information or references cited in the recent petition justifies a change in the regulatory status of atrazine," says Syngenta Crop Protection in its unsigned letter.

"Most of the studies cited in the petition have been previously considered by [the EPA], and the few that are more recent do not provide compelling scientific evidence that would support this petition," the company says. The majority of the mammalian studies cited by petitioners are designed to define mode-of-action, metabolism and toxicological endpoints, and not to predict risk to aquatic species, the company says.

Syngenta also criticizes the environmental group's petition for omitting several articles published by independent laboratories which indicate no effects of atrazine on amphibians.

EPA submitted atrazine to a detailed evaluation on the potential impacts on amphibian sexual development in 2003, and concluded that the chemical did not interfere with reproductive fitness, the company concludes.

EPA launched its latest re-evaluation of atrazine in 2009 and has convened four meetings of its FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel to examine various issues and provide guidance. The agency was expected to decide this fall whether to revise the current human health risk assessment for atrazine.

In 2012, EPA plans to ask the FIFRA SAP to review updated scientific analyses related to atrazine's potential effects on aquatic ecosystems, including amphibians. (Pesticide & Chemical Policy, November 18 2011, Volume: 39 Issue: 50)

EPA MEETS COURT DEADLINE FOR PESTICIDE GENERAL PERMIT, INDUSTRY STILL KEEN ON LEGISLATIVE FIX

EPA released its final National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) pesticide general permit on Monday, meeting its Oct. 31 court-ordered deadline for launching the controversial permitting regime.

The permit is the culmination of more than a decade of controversy and confusion about whether pesticides should be regulated under the Clean Water Act's NPDES program, which requires permits for point source discharges of pollutants into lakes, rivers and other waterways.

EPA was required to develop the permit by a January 2009 court ruling from the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals. The court vacated EPA's 2006 aquatic pesticides rule, concluding that pesticide residues and biological pesticides are pollutants subject to the NPDES program.

The court ruling was a major blow for the pesticide industry and agricultural groups, who argue that FIFRA labels provide restrictions on pesticide use needed to safeguard human health and the environment, including waters protected by the Clean Water Act.

Congress "never intended" for the intersection of the Clean Water Act and FIFRA, says Beau Greenwood, executive vice president of CropLife

America. "States will now be forced to implement and enforce duplicative regulations of pesticides, and divert limited resources from programs with an environmental benefit to a burdensome paperwork requirement for certain aquatic pesticide applications."

Many state agencies agree with that sentiment, according to Steve Dwinell, assistant director of the Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services' Division of Agricultural Environmental Services.

"The whole thing is absurd," says Dwinell, chair of EPA's State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group. "EPA has done a really good job making the best out of a bad situation, but there is widespread frustration because we shouldn't be doing this."

But environmental groups and other advocates of the permit disagree, arguing that FIFRA does little to protect the nation's waterways from pesticide pollution.

"These permits will reduce pesticide use with benefit to human health and the environment and without duplicative regulation because FIFRA and the Clean Water Act are fundamentally different statutes that do fundamentally different things," says Charlie Tebbutt, an attorney who represented environmental groups in their challenge of EPA's 2006 rule. "All FIFRA does is require registration. The Clean Water Act protects the environment."

Permit patchwork

The new permit is required for four types of pesticide applications "to, over or near waters of the U.S." - those aimed at controlling mosquitoes and other flying insects; aquatic weeds and algae; aquatic nuisance animals; and forest canopies.

Individuals and companies responsible for such applications - called "operators" - must take steps to reduce pesticide discharges by using the lowest effective amount of a pesticide and implement measures to prevent leaks and spills, such as calibrating equipment, while also monitoring for and reporting adverse incidents.

Operators who meet certain threshold levels and other conditions must also file notices of intent (NOIs) with EPA and compile pesticide management discharge plans, including a description of pest management options.

Upon announcing the final permit, EPA said operators would be automatically covered without submitting an NOI for any discharges prior to Jan. 12, 2012.

Furthermore, the agency has opted to delay enforcement and says for the first 120 days that the permit is in effect it will "focus on providing compliance assistance and education of the permit requirements, rather than on enforcement actions."

Delayed enforcement comes as little relief to industry critics, who note that such a pledge is limited in scope.

EPA's permit only directly covers the six states where EPA has NPDES permitting authority - Alaska, Idaho, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico and Oklahoma - as well as Washington, D.C., most U.S. territories and Indian country lands.

The agency's pledge to delay enforcement only extends to those areas and does not prevent liability from state actions or citizen suits, explains Tyler Wegmeyer, director of congressional relations with the American Farm Bureau.

"People still have the ability to put out notices of intent to sue," he says.

EPA spokesperson Enesta Jones tells *P&CP* that 36 states had informed EPA their permits would be ready by Oct. 31. The remaining eight are expected to largely mirror the EPA permit and be completed shortly, but stakeholders remain concerned that a patchwork of NPDES pesticide permits will cover the nation.

A few states, including Louisiana, Texas and Indiana, have developed a permitting approach that "basically calls on operators to comply with FIFRA," says James Skillen, director of science and

regulatory affairs at Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE).

Others, notably California, Michigan and New York "have gone the opposite direction" and imposed permit regimes more strict than the EPA permit, Skillen tells *P&CP*.

"If you are an operator who works in several states, the rules can be very different," he adds.

Skillen notes that some of the requirements in the EPA permit - such as those calling on operators to use the lowest effective amount of a pesticide - are vague and provide fertile ground for citizen suits.

"There is a lot that is open to interpretation, including the language to minimize amounts and minimize discharges," he says. "We have very real concerns about who decides 'the best amount' and there are real fears applicators could end up in court. There are a lot of unknowns with this."

Endangered Species Concerns

The provisions within EPA's permit regarding endangered species are another area of concern to industry stakeholders.

The final permit includes language to protect endangered and threatened species that fall under the purview of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), including an array of imperiled salmon and steelhead species in the Pacific Northwest as well as the short-nosed sturgeon, an endangered species residing in Atlantic waters. These provisions only affect the states and areas where EPA is the permitting authority.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) provisions within the permit allow NMFS to determine if applications within areas that contain the affected listed species or their habitat are eligible for coverage under EPA's permit and also lay out restrictions on timing and size of such applications.

"We just don't have a lot of experience with this level of consultation," Skillen says. "EPA suggests that they are going to share [an NOI] with NMFS,

and they are going to consult and get it back to you in 30 days. But how long that is really going to take is anybody's guess."

Furthermore, EPA has yet to complete its ESA consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

EPA says in its announcement of the final permit that it "continues to be in consultation" with FWS, explaining that once consultation is completed it will modify the permit if different permit limits or additional conditions are warranted to protect listed species or critical habitat.

"Any such change would require public notice and an opportunity for comment," according to EPA. "The current permit would remain in effect during those proceedings."

In or Out

Environmental advocates argue that industry stakeholders are effectively crying wolf and overstating the impacts and uncertainty surrounding the new permitting regime.

If anything, the permit does not go far enough, Tebbutt tells *P&CP*, because it does not require a "needs analysis" be conducted before a pesticide application is approved.

"Do pesticide users need to use the pesticides in the first place?" Tebbutt asks. "It has become spray first and see what happens later. You need to ask the questions first - why are these chemicals being used and why are they being used in the way they are? There are more often alternatives than not."

Tebbutt adds that industry groups like CropLife America and the American Farm Bureau are "telling lies, lies and more lies" about the scope of the permit.

"The permit does not apply to farmers and ranchers," Tebbutt tells *P&CP*.

EPA has failed to provide specific numbers on how many farmers may be affected by the permit, but it

said in documentation accompanying the draft permit that it expects the burden on farmers to "be minimal in that the Clean Water Act exempts agricultural stormwater and irrigation return flow from NPDES permitting requirements."

Wegmeyer argues that the permit offers vagaries that could pull farmers under its scope.

"EPA has said continuously that farmers won't be affected if they don't apply directly to water, but there are a tremendous amount who apply near water," he tells *P&CP*. "This is a grey area. You'll have situations that occur every time they take the sprayer out of the barn that could be a discharge to a U.S. water."

The ongoing effort by EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expand the definition of "U.S. waters" under the scope of the Clean Water Act could also potentially draw more users of agricultural pesticides under the NPDES umbrella, Wegmeyer adds.

"Ditches and ponds could fall under the scope of the law," Wegmeyer says. "It is hard to say what that might mean."

EPA and the states "have very carefully worded" their permits so as not to needlessly bring farmers and other agricultural pesticide users under the umbrella of the regime, adds Dwinell, but that doesn't alleviate the broader worry.

"The concern agricultural groups have is that now the court has opened the door to regulating pesticide use under a completely different statute," he says. "They fear they could get pulled in down the road."

Congressional interest

Critics of the new pesticide permit have found sympathy on Capitol Hill for their concerns and have not given up on lawmakers addressing the issue.

The House approved legislation in March - H.R. 872 - that would exempt FIFRA-compliant pesticide applications from requiring discharge permits under

the Clean Water Act. The Senate Agriculture Committee passed the bill by voice vote in June, but Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) and Ben Cardin (D-Md.) subsequently put a hold on the legislation.

Sen. Pat Roberts (R-Kan.) was leading negotiations with Democrats to try and get a vote on the bill before the Oct. 31 deadline - allegedly more than 60 senators have express support for the legislation.

But the Kansas Republican called off those talks due to frustration with a possible deal that would have imposed a two-year moratorium on the new pesticide permit while requiring a national survey on pesticide contamination to better gauge whether the permit is needed.

The survey was the piece of the puzzle Roberts could not stomach, according to Sarah Little, the senator's communications director.

The senator's "first preference" would be to approve H.R. 872, but "in the absence of that, he was always in support of a moratorium," Little tells *P&CP*. "Then [Democrats] insisted on a study. His position remains that a moratorium should be approved by the Senate so that agreements can be reached on studies or H.R. 872 can be passed."

Roberts this week failed in a bid to move legislation to suspend the permit for two years - a prior effort to attach such language to the fiscal 2012 agriculture appropriations bill was also unsuccessful.

James Aidala, vice president of policy and government affairs with Bergeson & Campbell, says he is "slightly surprised" Roberts didn't take the deal.

"Clearly he felt a little cranked since he's got sixty-plus votes, a House-enacted bill and still can't get anywhere," Aidala tells *P&CP*. "But if in 119 days the deal is still on the table, it might start to look a whole lot better."

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, November 7 2011, Volume: 39 Issue: 48)

In-State CEU Meetings

Date: November 1-3 2011

Title: OSU Last Chance CEU Meeting
Location: Magnuson Hotel and Conference
Center Oklahoma City OK

8:15 am to 11:45 am

Contact: Charles Luper or Kevin Shelton
405-744-5531

To Register: <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm>

Course #: OK-11-146

CEU's:

3

Category(s):

All Categories

ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course
www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm

All Star Pro Training
www.allstarce.com

CTN Educational Services Inc
http://ctnedu.com/oklahoma_applicator_enroll.html

Pest Network
<http://www.pestnetwork.com/>

Univar USA
<http://www.pestweb.com/>

Southwest Farm Press Spray Drift Mgmt
<http://www.pentonag.com/nationalsdm>

SW Farm Press Weed Resistance Mgmt in Cotton
<http://www.pentonag.com/CottonWRM>

Western Farm Press ABC's of MRLs
<http://www.pentonag.com/mrl>

**Western Farm Press Biopesticides Effective Use in Pest
Management Programs**
<http://www.pentonag.com/biopesticides>

Western Farm Press Principles & Efficient Chemigation
<http://www.pentonag.com/Valmont>

For more information and an updated list of
CEU meetings, click on this link:

<http://www.state.ok.us/~okag/cps-ceuhome.htm>

ODAFF Test Information

Pesticide applicator test sessions dates and locations for December 2011 are as follows:

December

1	Tulsa
6	Goodwell
7	Lawton
12	OKC
12	McAlester
15	Enid
22	Tulsa

Altus:	Western OK State College 2801 N Main, Room A23
Enid:	Garfield County Extension Office, 316 E. Oxford.
Goodwell:	Okla. Panhandle Research & Extension Center, Rt. 1 Box 86M
Hobart:	Kiowa County Extension Center Courthouse Annex, 302 N. Lincoln
Lawton:	Great Plains Coliseum, Annex Rm. 920 S. Sheridan Road.
McAlester:	Kiamichi Tech Center on Highway 270 W of HWY 69
OKC:	Oklahoma County Extension Office, 930 N. Portland.
Tulsa:	NE Campus of Tulsa Community College, (Apache & Harvard) Large Auditorium

HAPPY HOLIDAYS



**Pesticide Safety
Education Program**

**RENEWAL FORM TO REMAIN ON OR BE ADDED TO
PESTICIDE REPORT's MAILING LIST**

PLEASE PRINT - THANK YOU!

Name _____

Company/Business Name _____

Address _____

City _____ **State** _____ **Zip Code** _____

E-Mail _____

Please send to: Charles Luper or Kevin Shelton
Pesticide Safety Education Program
127 NRC
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-3033

or E-mail us at: Sharon.hillock@okstate.edu. Please type Pesticide Report in the subject box.

If this is not returned your name will be removed from the *Pesticide Report*'s mailing list.

Oklahoma State University EXTENSION personnel ARE NOT TO RETURN this form.