

# PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



## May 2012

## CHEM

- 1 OSU PSEP Test Help
- 1 EPA DENIES PETITION ON 2,4-D PESTICIDE
- 2 NEW RESTRICTIONS ON ROZOL USE IN SIX STATES
- 3 EPA LAUNCHES BED BUG INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE
- 4 TALK OF FARM BILL AS A VEHICLE TO ROLL BACK CWA PESTICIDE PERMIT
- 5 ACTIVISTS VOW TO BRING LEGAL ACTION IF USDA APPROVES DOW AGROSCIENCES' 2,4-D-TOLERANT BIOTECH CORN
- 7 RULES IN SOME STATE PGPS SEEN AS HASTENING SPREAD OF HERBICIDE-RESISTANT WEEDS
- 9 CEU Meetings
- 9 Online CEU Links
- 10 ODAFF Test Session Information

or on site (if space available). **ODAFF Testing fees are not included in the registration fee and must be paid separately.** Register online at the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) website at <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm>. Registration forms can also be downloaded from the website. More dates have been scheduled for Oklahoma City and Tulsa for 2012 please check the website or watch the newsletter for future dates. The next test help will be October 1<sup>st</sup> in Oklahoma City at the Oklahoma County Extension Center.

Registration will start at 8:45 and the program will run from 9:00 am to 12:30 pm. Testing will begin at 1:30 pm.

**NO CEU's will be given for this program!**

### OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program next test help session will be May 30<sup>th</sup> in Tulsa. The meetings will be held at the Tulsa County Extension Center 4116 E. 15<sup>th</sup>.

This testing session will focus on information covered in the core/service tech test. OSU PSEP will also answer any questions over other category tests during this session.

Cost of registration is \$30 if received by May 25<sup>th</sup>. Registration will increase to \$50 after by May 25<sup>th</sup>

### EPA DENIES PETITION ON 2,4-D PESTICIDE

In a petition filed on November 6, 2008, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) requested that EPA cancel all product registrations and revoke all tolerances (legal residue limits in food) for the pesticide 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, or 2,4-D. After considering public comment received on the petition and all the available studies,

EPA is denying the request to revoke all tolerances and the request to cancel all registrations.

By way of background, in 2005, as part of the regulatory process to ensure pesticides meet current regulatory standards, EPA completed a review on the registration and on the safety of the tolerances for 2,4-D. EPA determined that all products containing 2,4-D are eligible for reregistration, provided certain changes were incorporated into the labels and additional data were generated and submitted to the EPA for review.

During the recent review of the petition from NRDC to revoke the tolerances, EPA evaluated all the data cited by NRDC and new studies submitted to EPA in response to the reregistration decision. Included in the new studies is a state-of-the-science extended one-generation reproduction study. That study provides an in-depth examination of 2,4-D's potential for endocrine disruptor, neurotoxic, and immunotoxic effects. This study and EPA's comprehensive review confirmed EPA's previous finding that the 2,4-D tolerances are safe.

EPA also carefully reviewed NRDC's request that the Agency cancel all 2,4-D product registrations. Based on studies addressing endocrine effects on wildlife species and the adequacy of personal protective equipment for workers, the Agency concluded that the science behind our current ecological and worker risk assessments for 2,4-D is sound and there is no basis to change the registrations.

2,4-D is a phenoxy herbicide and plant growth regulator that has been used in the U.S. since the 1940s. It is currently found in approximately 600 products registered for agricultural, residential, industrial, and aquatic uses. There are 85 tolerances for 2,4-D. EPA published the NRDC petition for public comment on December 24, 2008.

Below are EPA documents responding to NRDC's petition on 2,4-D including a pre-publication copy of the agency's Federal Register Order. These documents are also available on EPA's website at [www.epa.gov/pesticides](http://www.epa.gov/pesticides). A 60-day period for filing objections and requests for a hearing on the Order runs from the date of publication in the Federal Register Notice [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0877](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/2-4d-petition.html). (EPA April 9, 2012) [http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb\\_page/updates/2012/2-4d-petition.html](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/2-4d-petition.html)

## **NEW RESTRICTIONS ON ROZOL USE IN SIX STATES TO PROTECT THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES**

To address the potential effects from Rozol Prairie Dog Bait to wildlife listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, the EPA is publishing Endangered Species Protection Bulletins for Rozol Prairie Dog Bait on its [Bulletins Live! website](#).

These Bulletins reflect agreements made between the registrant for Rozol Prairie Dog Bait (LiphaTech), the EPA, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (FWS) to implement the Conservation Measures described in FWS's final and draft Biological Opinions addressing the potential effects from Rozol Prairie Dog Bait to wildlife listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The EPA sought comments on FWS's draft Biological Opinion in January 2012. FWS's draft and final Biological Opinions for Rozol Prairie Dog Bait are available in the docket ([EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0909](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/2-4d-petition.html)) at Regulations.gov and at [www.epa.gov/espp](http://www.epa.gov/espp).

Based on these conservation measures, we anticipate that the use of Rozol Prairie Dog Bait is not likely to result in jeopardy of any listed threatened or endangered species. The Conservation Measures include:

Prohibiting application of Rozol Prairie Dog Bait within current and future black-footed ferret (*Mustela nigripes*) reintroduction areas to reduce the level of impact on the black-footed ferret;

Prohibiting application of Rozol Prairie Dog Bait within five southwestern New Mexico counties to avoid impacts on listed species including the Chiricahua leopard frog (*Lithobates [Rana] chiricahuensis*), jaguar (*Panthera onca*), New Mexico ridge-nosed rattlesnake (*Crotalus willardi obscures*), Mexican gray wolf (*Canis lupus*), and the Mexican spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis lucida*);

Shortening the application season where the range of the black-tailed prairie dog overlaps with listed species including the grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) and Preble's meadow jumping mouse (*Zapus hudsonius preblei*); and

Amending the Rozol product label to require enhanced searches to remove poisoned prairie dogs.

These Bulletins will put into place geographic restrictions on the use of Rozol Prairie Dog Bait in six states (Colorado, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Wyoming) in order to minimize potential adverse impacts to eight federally listed species. The Bulletins will become enforceable on October 1, 2012, which is the start of the Rozol Prairie Dog Bait use season. (EPA April 10, 2012)

[http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb\\_page/updates/2012/rozol-bulletins.html](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/rozol-bulletins.html)

## **EPA LAUNCHES BED BUG INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is launching an online Bed Bug Information Clearinghouse. It contains peer-reviewed bed bug outreach materials from a variety of different sources such as governments, universities and extension services. Stemming from a top recommendation from EPA's Second Annual National Bed Bug Summit, the Bed Bug Information Clearinghouse is a collaborative effort between EPA and partners in the Federal Bed Bug Workgroup.

The goal of the Bed Bug Information Clearinghouse is to provide a "one-stop" location for communities throughout the country to exchange information and outreach materials on the control, detection and prevention of bed bugs. This will help communities conserve resources and provide improved effectiveness and accuracy of community outreach materials. The Clearinghouse is searchable based on:

Audience – such as Hotels, Health Centers, Housing Authorities, Schools, Shelters, Residential Consumers, etc.

Topic – Detection, Prevention, Non-chemical Control, Management, Pesticides

Type of product – Outreach Materials such as Factsheets, Brochures, Websites, etc.

The Clearinghouse will include information in English and other languages as available. Some of the current information focuses on identifying and treating bed bug infestations in various types of situations. In addition, there is information on several different types of treatments such the use of heat to kill bed bugs.

While there is no quick fix for bed bug infestations, having accurate information about bed bug control will help keep the public from over-applying or misusing pesticides. There are a variety of non-chemical approaches for controlling, detecting and preventing bed bugs that have been shown to be effective, including:

Checking for bed bugs on luggage and clothing when returning from a trip

Looking for bed bugs or signs of an infestation on second-hand items, such as a sofa or bed, before bringing the item into your home

Reducing clutter where bed bugs can hide

Using a protective cover that encases mattresses and box springs

A more informed public is a better partner in the control, detection and prevention of bed bugs. With the help of community advocates distributing outreach materials from the Clearinghouse to the public, EPA hopes that this will lead to increased prevention as well as a reduction in infestations.

Visit the Bed Bug Information Clearinghouse <http://www.epa.gov/opp00001/bedbugs/bedbug-clearinghouse.html>. For more information on bed bugs, visit <http://www.epa.gov/bedbugs/>.

(EPA April 23, 2012)

[http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb\\_page/updates/2012/bedbug-ch.html](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/bedbug-ch.html)

## TALK OF FARM BILL AS A VEHICLE TO ROLL BACK CWA PESTICIDE PERMIT

An environmental group is sounding the alarm of a possible “sneak attack on water quality” by attaching House Resolution 872, a stalled bill exempting FIFRA-compliant pesticide applications from permitting requirements under the Clean Water Act, to the 2012 Farm Bill.

Bill Snape, senior counsel at the Center for Biological Diversity, says he’s heard about the possibility of reviving H.R. 872 through talks with a staffer on the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The Senate Agriculture Committee approved the farm bill 12-4 April 26 without the H.R. 872 language, but NGOs anticipate the language would likely be included during full Senate consideration of the bill or in conference with the House when the two farm bills are reconciled. David DeGennaro, legislative and policy analyst with the Environmental Working Group, says they have heard similar rumors about H.R. 872.

“Presumably ... if there is going to be an effort to attach it, it would happen when the Farm Bill goes to the floor, or in conference with the House if it makes it that far,” DeGennaro writes in an e-mail to *Pesticide & Chemical Policy*.

H.R. 872 passed in the House in March 2011 with strong support from the agriculture and pesticide industries but stalled in the Senate after Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) and Ben Cardin (D-Md.) put holds on the bill. Through a spokesperson, Cardin tells *P&CP* that the pesticide general permitting program has been “working fine” since it was introduced in October. “Our view on that is, it’s yesterday’s news. We’re moving forward.”

Industry continues to push to exempt pesticides from Clean Water Act permitting, required due to a 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals 2009 ruling and something industry sees as duplicative with FIFRA

requirements. Officials with CropLife America and the National Corn Growers Association declined to discuss specific efforts to get H.R. 872 language into the Farm Bill, but told *P&CP* that passing H.R. 872 continues to be a priority.

Whether something as large and controversial as the Farm Bill could even pass before the November elections is up for debate, but Snape thinks if the Farm Bill were to pass, it would be between now and the July 4 congressional recess, after which election day politics comes into full swing.

“You do see these patterns and cycles in election years, and it strikes me that if the Senate is going to take any sort of this spaghetti that the House has been throwing up on the floor ... that this is the window,” Snape says. “We’re enough out from the election that a deal could be struck.”

The House Committee on Agriculture has hearings on its Farm Bill scheduled until the Memorial Day recess that begins April 28, so it would be “premature to talk about what is and what is not in the Farm Bill,” committee spokesperson Tamara Hinton tells *P&CP*.

Recent action on H.R. 872 extends beyond the Farm Bill. In what’s viewed as a mostly political statement, Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) and John Barrasso (R-Wyo.) introduced on April 25 the Western Economic Security Today Act, which includes eight House-passed bills that have stalled in the Senate, including H.R. 872.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, April 27 2012, Volume: 40 Issue: 20)

## **ACTIVISTS VOW TO BRING LEGAL ACTION IF USDA APPROVES DOW AGROSCIENCES’ 2,4-D-TOLERANT BIOTECH CORN**

A coalition of environmental and consumer groups is planning to sue if the Department of Agriculture’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) allows unrestricted planting of a 2,4-D-tolerant biotech corn variety produced by Dow AgroSciences.

“We’re committed to legal action,” Center for Food Safety Analyst Bill Freese said during an April 26 press conference. APHIS’s plant pest risk assessment of Dow’s biotech corn is “very deeply flawed in many ways. They very much rely on Dow’s statements and claims, and actually don’t even do any assessment of how much more 2,4-D will be used.”

APHIS has fielded more than 5,700 mostly negative comments on Dow’s petition to deregulate the crop.

APHIS initially posted the deregulation petition in the Dec. 27 *Federal Register* and said it would accept comments through Feb. 27. On Feb. 22, APHIS extended the comment period through April 27. The agency says the trait in the corn, DAS-40278-9, “has been genetically engineered for increased resistance to broadleaf herbicides in the phenoxy auxin group (such as the herbicide 2,4-D)” and resistance to another group of herbicides called AOPPs that control grassy weeds.

Dow hopes to make the genetically altered corn available to U.S. growers under the trade name “Enlist” in time for the 2013 planting season. The company could add a glyphosate-tolerance trait to the crop and expects it to be popular with corn growers who have been battling glyphosate-resistant weeds. As of 2010, 66% of corn acreage in major producing states was treated with glyphosate, according to USDA.

Farm division

But some farmers want APHIS to reject the petition. In comments submitted to the agency, an activist coalition representing 145 groups, including consumer, environmental, farm and other organizations, cites studies linking 2,4-D to adverse impacts on animals and other studies suggesting harm to children where the chemical is widely used. They say increased use of 2,4-D, which is volatile and prone to drift, would damage nearby non-resistant crops and could cost organic farmers their marketing certification. They also predict the new GE crops will not slow down the emergence of resistant weeds unless there are mandatory limits on production of the altered crop.

The groups say while none of these threats “are unique to [herbicide-resistant] crops, they are all escalated by the intended use of these crop systems and the characteristic ways in which they are managed ... USDA has broad authority, the mandate and the means to protect farmers and the environment. The harms of this crop system plainly fall under USDA’s purview. Ignoring them would violate the agency’s statutory duties, as well as unnecessarily put farmers, businesses, the public and the environment at risk.”

One of the groups that signed the comments, the National Family Farm Coalition, held a press conference April 26 during which several farmers spoke out against deregulation. Margot McMillan, of Kingdom City, Mo., said, “I’ve got workers that are generally young people who want to have a full life ahead of them, and I worry about them and their health, what might happen to them in the future if they’re exposed to this.”

George Naylor, who raises non-biotech corn and soybeans near Churdan, Iowa, said biotech crops have increased herbicide use and made agriculture less sustainable. He said his crops would be susceptible to 2,4-D, as would those of his state’s growing grape and wine industry. “I believe it’s time for family farmers to say ‘no’ to the chemical companies rolling out their technologies without regard for the health and environmental consequences, not to mention the damage to other

crops and the very livability of our own rural neighborhoods,” he said.

Other groups among the 145 that signed on to the comments include Food and Water Watch, the Natural Resources Defense Council and Pesticide Action Network North America.

1,070% more 2,4-D

The coalition cites an estimate by Charles Benbrook, chief scientist of The Organic Center, that approval of the biotech corn would result in a 1,070% increase in pounds of 2,4-D applied to corn acreage in five years.

These data are also cited in comments filed with APHIS April 26 by the Save Our Crops Coalition (SOCC), which represents farm and agribusiness interests that are concerned about the effect on non-target crops from approval of Dow’s Enlist and other herbicide-tolerant crops being developed by Dow and Monsanto. Echoing a petition it filed with APHIS April 18, SOCC writes in its comments that APHIS’s plant pest risk assessment for Enlist does not consider the cumulative environmental impacts of all synthetic auxin herbicide-tolerant crops.

“Upon consideration, APHIS would find the adverse environmental impact of synthetic auxin herbicide spray drift and volatilization to significantly affect the quality of the human environment,” SOCC writes. “Therefore, the environmental assessment for Dow 2,4-D Tolerant Corn is insufficient, and APHIS should prepare an [Environmental Impact Statement] to address the environmental impact of all synthetic auxin herbicide tolerant crops.”

But the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA) “believes the draft environmental assessment is adequate and supports a determination of nonregulated status.”

In comments to APHIS, NCGA President Garry Niemeyer writes, “The availability of new tools, technologies and systems of production is critical in order for corn growers to meet growing market demands ... With the reported compromise of some

weed species to glyphosate, new tools to expand weed management practices are essential to maintain the integrity of this widely used technology.” Niemeyer says NCGA members “have a long history of successfully addressing coexistence, with most cases on a farmer-to-farmer or neighbor-to-neighbor basis,” and would employ the same behavior if provided the opportunity to utilize Dow’s Enlist corn.

#### Less volatile 2,4-D

In addition, Niemeyer says Dow “will be offering new products in conjunction with the trait to increase safety and stewardship opportunities for growers.” In an e-mail response to the allegations in the environmental/consumer coalition’s comments, Dow AgroSciences spokesperson Garry Hamlin tells *Pesticide & Chemical Policy* the company’s technology package for the biotech corn will include a new formulation of 2,4-D with “a demonstrated 92 percent reduction in volatility and a 90 percent reduction in drift, based on research data recently presented at scientific meetings.”

With regard to the coalition’s expressed concerns for human health related to 2,4-D, Hamlin says EPA has determined “that current uses (including currently authorized uses on corn), pose ‘a reasonable certainty of no harm’... Although pesticide opponents continue to repeat the same old claims, the fact remains that EPA has thoroughly evaluated and responded to them, in great detail, on multiple occasions in the past, in a transparent public process in which all stakeholder opinions — including the opinions of pesticide opponents — were carefully taken into account by regulators charged with the protection of public health.”

And he says Dow’s product will help combat the weed resistance problem. “Farm herbicide use has been steadily increasing for a number of years, and that increase is going to get worse without new agricultural technology like our herbicide-tolerant corn to combat glyphosate-resistant weeds,” he tells *P&CP*.

Echoing that view is Stephen Powles, a professor at the University of Western Australia and director of

the Australian Herbicide Resistance Initiative. In his comments to APHIS, Powles says that with the widespread evolution of glyphosate-resistant weed populations, “U.S. growers are going to have to introduce herbicide and non-herbicide diversity into their farming systems,” which includes the rotation and/or sequencing of herbicides of different modes of action. He writes, “I regard the Enlist herbicide technology as an example of good herbicide diversity,” adding that auxins like 2,4-D “are low risk from a resistance evolution viewpoint.”

(*Pesticide & Chemical Policy*, April 27 2012, Volume: 40 Issue: 20)

## **RULES IN SOME STATE PGPS SEEN AS HASTENING SPREAD OF HERBICIDE-RESISTANT WEEDS**

By encouraging pesticide application rates lower than specified on product labels, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Pesticide General Permits (PGPs) in about a dozen states could potentially encourage the spread of herbicide-resistant weeds.

That’s the concern of Dow AgroSciences’ Regulatory and Government Affairs Leader for Range and Pasture Products John Jachetta, also a former president of the Weed Science Society of America (WSSA). He worries these state PGPs, modeled off a draft PGP from EPA that has since changed in response to public comment, would require applicators to follow policies blamed, in part, for giving rise to herbicide-resistant weeds.

EPA’s initial PGP language was to “use the lowest effective amount of pesticide product per application and optimum frequency ... consistent with reducing the potential for development of pest resistance.” Because the pesticide label is already

the lowest effective rate, as established through industry trials, Jachetta and WSSA have argued this policy would be confusing and troublesome, with applicators feeling compelled because of lawsuit threats to apply lower-than-ideal rates, leading to herbicide resistance.

WSSA, in comments sent to EPA in 2010, said this “lowest effective” language would result in “research-based judgments the applicator is unqualified to make.” WSSA said this language would replace “extensive scientific knowledge incorporated in product labels with arbitrarily selected low use rates.”

In response, EPA changed the language in its final PGP to recommending using “only the amount of pesticide and frequency of pesticide application necessary to control the target pest,” which Jachetta calls a “well-reasoned response.”

Because the PGPs had to be written in a limited timeframe, many states did not incorporate this modified language. Jachetta says Arkansas, Kentucky, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia and Wyoming have the old EPA language or something similar, though he said some are in the process of changing the rules.

For example, Arkansas has a policy in its PGP recommending that applicators “reduce [pesticide] dosages in order to avoid establishing a population of resistant organisms and instead allowing some survivors to pass on genes for susceptibility.” Jachetta says this policy is just plain “wrong” and would encourage, not discourage, herbicide resistance.

In Kentucky, the state’s draft PGP recommended that if two pounds of a pesticide per acre were shown to be effective, an applicator could not increase it to four pounds per acre, even if this was permitted by the label. Jachetta says this is “dangerously misguided” because it doesn’t account for changing weed conditions. (Kentucky’s final PGP removed this language, he says).

If applicators don’t follow state PGP recommendations to use lower rates, even if applicators are only trying to minimize herbicide resistance, Jachetta predicts they could be subject to citizen lawsuits, from those acting on application records without knowing the full context.

“People will get your application records, they’ll look over your plan, they’ll decide that, ‘What do you know, the [application] rates have been raised.’” Jachetta says. “They won’t know about the stage of development of the weeds, they won’t know if the composition of the weeds have changes, they won’t know an awful lot of things about applicator judgment.”

Jachetta worries about policies that push applicators back to a widely held belief in the 1990s that reducing herbicide application rates was an “environmentally sound practice,” a time when farmers would cut back on herbicide spraying in a given year, generating short-time savings on herbicides but long-term negative consequences of hastening the spread of herbicide-resistant weeds.

So what’s industry to do? Jachetta advises that applicators follow one of the nine recommendations on battling herbicide-resistant weeds that WSSA plans to publish in May, which is to apply pesticides at the full labeled rates, even when using a mixture of pesticides with multiple modes of action.

Jachetta also notes a WSSA recommendation that industry start to create pesticide labels with minimum use rates, because the “minimum rate is then enforceable in the state,” thus preventing state PGPs from driving herbicide resistance.

Jachetta spoke April 5 at the spring conference of CropLife America and Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, April 13 2012, Volume: 40 Issue: 18)

## **In-State CEU Meetings**

Date: May 15, 2012

Title: Ewing Irrigation IPM Herbicides & Fungicides

8 am to Noon            Fee: \$39

Location: Bass Pro Shops Broken Arrow OK

Contact: Dawn Norris (800)-343-9464 Ext. 229

<http://www.ewingeducationservices.com/>

Course #: OK-12-045

CEU's:                    Category(s):

4                            3A

4                            10

Date: May 16, 2012

Title: IPM for the Landscape Professional

8 am to 3:30 pm            Fee: \$80

Location: OSU Campus Stillwater OK

Contact: Stephanie Larmier 405 744-5404

[https://secure.touchnet.com/C20271\\_ustores/web/store\\_cat.jsp?STOREID=3&CATID=76](https://secure.touchnet.com/C20271_ustores/web/store_cat.jsp?STOREID=3&CATID=76)

Course #: Pending

CEU's:                    Category(s):

4                            3A

4                            10

2                            3b

2                            3c

Date: July 19, 2012

Title: BWI Tulsa Summer Seminar

Location: Bass Pro Shops Tulsa/Broken Arrow OK

Contact: Kelly Keech    (918) 251-6461

Course #: OK-12-048

CEU's:                    Category(s):

4                            3C

4                            10

## **ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links**

**Technical Learning College**

<http://www.abctlc.com/>

**Green Applicator Training**

<http://www.greenapplicator.com/training.asp>

**All Star Pro Training**

[www.allstarce.com](http://www.allstarce.com)

**Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course**

[www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm](http://www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm)

**CTN Educational Services Inc**

[http://www.ctnedu.com/oklahoma\\_applicator.html](http://www.ctnedu.com/oklahoma_applicator.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 May/June 2012 are as follows:

May		June	
3	Enid	5	Goodwell
7	OKC	7	OKC
10	Tulsa	14	Tulsa
22	OKC	25	OKC
24	Tulsa	28	Tulsa

## Pesticide Safety Education Program

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