

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



June, 2012

CHEM

- 1 OSU PSEP LAWNCARE PROGRAM
- 1 ATRAZINE TO REMAIN AVAILABLE AFTER LAWSUIT AGAINST SYNGENTA SETTLES
- 2 EPA SEEKS ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON PESTICIDE SULFURYL FLUORIDE (PROFUME)
- 2 EPA REGISTERS COLD PRESSED NEEM OIL TO CONTROL BED BUGS
- 3 STUDY FINDS ORGANIC FARMING BRINGS LOWER YIELDS
- 4 FIPRONIL LITIGATION 'HEATS UP' ALONG WITH THE TERMITE SEASON
- 7 SYNGENTA FINED \$102,000 FOR MISBRANDED PESTICIDES
- 7 FEDERAL AGENCIES SEEK TO ASSURE CONSUMERS ON PESTICIDES FOUND IN BABY FOODS, OTHER ITEMS
- 9 EXOTIC TREE TERMITE CONFIRMED IN FLORIDA
- 9 CEU Meetings
- 10 Online CEU Links
- 10 ODAFF Test Session Information

Topics to be covered: Flea and Tick Control for Lawns, Lawn Measurements and Sprayer Calibration, Lawn Fertility (Does Not Qualify for CEU).

Registration cost is \$30 for pre-registration by July 6 and \$50 after July 6. You can find registration forms or register online at <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm>. Please contact Charles Luper at 405-744-5808 for any questions. (PSEP)

ATRAZINE TO REMAIN AVAILABLE AFTER LAWSUIT AGAINST SYNGENTA SETTLES

The settlement of a lawsuit against Syngenta related to the herbicide Atrazine ensures that corn farmers who depend on the important product continue to farm efficiently and safely, the National Corn Growers Association said. While NCGA is concerned about the longer term impacts of unmerited class-action lawsuits against agricultural production, it is important that this case was resolved with an acknowledgement of the safety of atrazine.

"We're relieved that a settlement has been reached that will allow our farmer members to use this proven and safe tool on their farms," said NCGA President Garry Niemeyer. "Atrazine safety has

OSU PSEP LAWNCARE PEST MANAGEMENT & FERTILITY PROGRAM

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will conduct a Lawn care CEU programs in July. The program will be held July 13 at the Oklahoma County Extension Office (930 N Portland). The program will run from 9 am to 12:30 pm. 2 CEU's for categories 3A and 10 will be available

been verified by thousands of studies and numerous reviews by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and we're happy to have this nuisance lawsuit behind us so our growers can move forward and do what they do best - help feed and fuel the world, sustainably."

According to the settlement, the scientific evidence continues to make it clear that no one ever has or ever could be exposed to enough atrazine in water to affect their health when the product is used according to its label. The plaintiffs acknowledge that they have not commissioned and are not aware of any new scientific studies relating to the safety of atrazine. In addition, Syngenta reports that the cost of the settlement to the company is \$105 million. According to local news, lawyers for the plaintiffs are expected to receive \$35 million of this settlement. (Oklahoma Farm Report May 25, 2012) http://oklahomafarmreport.com/wire/news/2012/05/00139_AtrazineSuitSettles05252012_154537.php

EPA SEEKS ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON PESTICIDE SULFURYL FLUORIDE (PROFUME)

On May 1, EPA published a Federal Register notice requesting comment on several issues raised during the 2011 comment period on the proposed tolerance revocation and stay request for the pesticide sulfuryl fluoride. Interested parties will have an opportunity to provide additional perspective and information on legal arguments raised during the previous comment period. EPA is also asking stakeholders to provide further information on the availability of alternatives and the potential impacts from the withdrawal of the sulfuryl fluoride and fluoride tolerances (legal residue limits on food). Sulfuryl fluoride is an alternative to the ozone depleting pesticide methyl bromide, and is currently registered for the control of insect pests in stored grains, dried fruits, tree nuts, coffee and cocoa

beans, and for use in food handling and processing facilities. This comment period will be open for 90 days, until July 30, 2012. Submit your comments in docket [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0174](http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/sulfuryl-fluoride/) at [Regulations.gov](http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/sulfuryl-fluoride/).

For more information, please visit <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/sulfuryl-fluoride/>.

(EPA May 1, 2012)
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/sulfuryl-fluoride.html

EPA REGISTERS COLD PRESSED NEEM OIL TO CONTROL BED BUGS

To provide additional tools to control bed bugs, recently EPA issued registrations for two new products. TER-TRU1, containing 5.5% Cold Pressed Neem Oil, is a ready-to-use formulation for spot treatment by residential and commercial users. TER-CX1, containing 22.0% Cold Pressed Neem Oil, is a concentrate formulation for commercial use in the treatment of whole rooms. Cold Pressed Neem Oil has a non-toxic mode of action, is naturally occurring in the environment, and has a long history of safe use for other applications.

Cold Pressed Neem Oil is pressed directly from seeds of the Neem tree, a tropical evergreen tree found in Southeast Asia and Africa. The oil contains various compounds that have insecticidal and medicinal properties. It is also used in making products including shampoos, toothpaste, soaps, and cosmetics. Based on the data submitted to the EPA, these new products meet the required standards for safety and effectiveness. Performance trials

conducted at the approved label rates show both products control bed bug adults, nymphs, and eggs.

One of the EPA's goals is to actively work with industry and researchers to identify new compounds (or new uses of existing compounds) to control bed bugs, and help pest management professionals and the public obtain the latest information and tools for effective bed bug control. EPA expedited the processing of this registration to meet public health pest needs.

These two products have been added to the EPA's Bed Bug Product Search Tool, an online resource for searching EPA-registered bed bug products. Along with the EPA's Bed Bug Information Clearinghouse, the online resources aim to provide information useful in the prevention and control of bed bug infestations.

For background information on EPA's decision to register Cold Pressed Neem Oil to control bed bugs, see the Biopesticides Registration Action Document:

http://www.epa.gov/oppbppd1/biopesticides/ingredients/tech_docs/brad_025006.pdf.

To access the database of EPA-registered Bed Bug products, visit: <http://cfpub.epa.gov/oppref/bedbug/>.

For more information on bed bugs, visit <http://www.epa.gov/bedbugs/>.

(EPA May 24, 2012)
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/neemoil-bedbugs.html

STUDY FINDS ORGANIC FARMING BRINGS LOWER YIELDS

Yields on organic farms may rival those from conventional farming for fruit and soybeans but are significantly lower for most crops, especially vegetables and some cereals, a major review of ongoing research concludes.

Conventional farms can achieve up to 34% higher yields on the same area of land, while the average difference is usually 25%, finds research led by Verena Seufert of Canada's McGill University.

The yield gap can be reduced to 13% when "best organic practices" such as crop rotation are used and varies wildly for different crop types, say the researchers.

"These results suggest that today's organic systems may nearly rival conventional yields in some cases — with particular crop types, growing conditions and management practices — but often they do not," they claim.

Comparable yields, typically just 5% lower, were found for rain-fed legumes and perennials grown on weak-acidic and weak-alkaline soils on organic farms compared to conventional ones.

However, organic farming performs particularly worse for vegetables and some cereals, according to the findings.

Critics of organic farming argue that the extra land required due to lower yields negates the environmental benefits of applying fewer amounts of chemical fertilizers and pesticides to the soil.

"Output growth — yielding more crop per hectare — will be the single most important factor in helping food supplies keep pace with rapidly rising demand," says Dominic Dyer, chief executive of the U.K. Crop Protection Association, who commissioned the study.

Nonetheless, the researchers suggest that the lag in yield for organic crops can be narrowed down if their nitrogen supply is increased, while a mixture of farming types may yet bring the best economic, social and environmental impacts.

“Improvements in organic management techniques, or adoption of organic agriculture under environmental conditions where it performs best, may help close the yield gap,” they claim.

“In some cases, organic farmers may benefit by making limited use of chemical fertilizers instead of relying only on manure to supply nitrogen to their crops,” says the lead researcher Seufert.

Different techniques, “including organic, conventional and possible ‘hybrid’ systems “will be needed to achieve food security, the researchers conclude.

The meta-analysis, published in *Nature* last week, looked at 66 studies comparing 34 crop types on conventional and organic farms.

Future work carried out by Seufert will assess the environmental impacts of organic farming

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, May 4 2012, Volume: 40 Issue: 21)

FIPRONIL LITIGATION ‘HEATS UP’ ALONG WITH THE TERMITE SEASON

The ongoing dispute over the future of fipronil between BASF and Makhteshim, along with its U.S. subsidiary Control Solutions Inc. (CSI) – which lay dormant for much of the winter, at least publicly – has entered a new, potentially critical phase as the parties once again squared off in U.S District Court in early May.

In the latest round of the high-stakes legal battle, which began more than two years ago, BASF asked Judge William L. Osteen, Jr. of the U.S. District

Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to find Makhteshim Agan of North America (MANA) in contempt for allegedly violating a court order restricting the company from producing fipronil-based termiticides using any manufacturing process other than that set forth in the original order, a charge Makhteshim denies.

At the center of the dispute is whether or not Makhteshim infringed on a BASF manufacturing “process” patent for fipronil, and thus is in violation of an October 2010 consent agreement signed by the two parties (see timeline). In addition to restricting MANA from entering the U.S. market with fipronil-based termiticides using a manufacturing process other than that which they represented at that time would not infringe BASF’s manufacturing patents (‘943 and ‘945), the consent agreement states MANA must promptly notify BASF of any “material change” in the company’s manufacturing process for fipronil, marketed in the U.S. as Taurus SC.

According to BASF’s motion for contempt, which was filed on April 30, MANA and CSI “violated that Consent Judgment by selling in the United States fipronil made with a materially different process and providing BASF with no notice at all. BASF believes the new process is likely to infringe one of its patents and seeks further information to confirm that conclusion.”

Jan Buberl, director of specialty products, BASF North American Crop Protection, said that in the company’s ongoing testing of Taurus SC, BASF discovered a certain chemical reactant, trifluoroacetic acid (TFA), “that was not permitted or disclosed as part of the manufacturing process identified by Makhteshim in connection with the agreed upon order,” according to a company press release.

CSI President Mark Boyd disputes that claim, noting MANA has “never varied in the way that it makes fipronil technical,” a point echoed by Moshe

Nussbaum, global head of insecticide sector, Makhteshim Agan Industries (MAI). “Our position remains the same – that there has been no change at all, nor any material change, in the manufacturing process of fipronil,” he said. “MAI manufactures fipronil using a proprietary process and has filed a patent application to protect its intellectual property rights to this process.”

It’s important to note that the recent motion filed by BASF is not a patent infringement claim, but rather a motion for discovery. “It will be a question for the court to determine whether MANA is using TFA,” Buberl said. “As indicated in our pleadings, BASF has replicated its findings of TFA in multiple samples of Taurus. The original formulation as disclosed by MANA is subject to a protective order. The conclusion would be if you find the reactant in the final product there is a high likelihood that it was used in the manufacturing process. That is why we are asking the court for new discovery on this issue.”

In addition to seeking further information about the reactant issue, as part of its motion for contempt BASF is asking the Court to provide various forms of relief for the “harm incurred due to Defendants’ non-compliance with the Court’s Order.” Specifically, they are asking the Court to:

- Prevent MANA/CSI from making, selling or offering for sale in the United States any products containing fipronil manufactured by any process other than the “currently intended process” as defined in the original consent judgment;
- Order MANA/CSI to provide BASF with an accounting of all sales in the United States of Taurus SC, or any other fipronil-containing products manufactured by the Defendants, occurring after the date of the court’s order, identifying for each sale the product sold; the date of the sale; the quantity sold; the batch identification of the product sold; and whether the

batch was made by other than the currently intended process;

- Order MANA/CSI to provide BASF with discovery on the process(es) by which all fipronil in Defendants’ U.S. fipronil-containing products has been made;
- Order MANA/CSI to pay BASF damages for all sales of Taurus SC product, or any other fipronil-containing product, manufactured in violation of the court’s order;
- Order MANA/CSI to verify that all existing inventory produced in violation of the court’s order and intended for sale in the United States has been destroyed; and
- Order MANA/CSI to pay BASF all costs, expenses and fees, including but not limited to reasonable attorneys’ fees, incurred by BASF in connection with the case.

Buberl said predicting what the Court ultimately will decide is “speculation,” but there are a wide range of options available including “remedies or sanctions” if the Court finds in BASF’s favor.

While recognizing the high-stakes nature of the litigation, Makhteshim’s Nussbaum remains confident in the company’s position. “We quite simply don’t see that BASF’s motion has merit,” he said. “We are also confident in our belief that the court will deny the motion and recognize their ongoing efforts as an attempt to disrupt the marketplace and our customer relationships.”

In fact, three days after BASF’s motion was filed with the Court, MANA and CSI provided a “preliminary response” opposing the motion and highlighting recent correspondence between the parties that it claims illustrates a desire on BASF’s part to “interfere” with the company’s channel relationships and customers.

“Based on the timing of the recent court filing, BASF delayed this legal action until April 2012, which is the peak time for termite control,” observed Nussbaum. “Our assumption is that BASF strategically planned another attempt to negatively impact MAI/CSI channel sales alongside causing interference with customers and channel relationships regarding the case. At this time, MAI and CSI are confident in their ability to ‘call out’ BASF allegations as untrue, claim BASF findings are once again without technical merit, and believe the U.S. court system will deny the motion – recognizing their intent to interrupt both organization’s business and relationships successes in the marketplace.”

BASF’s Buberl, however, disagrees with Makhteshim’s characterization of its motivation for filing the motion. “BASF is only trying to enforce its rights under the Consent Judgment,” he said. “Prior to its May 1, 2012 filing, BASF did seek to discuss this issue with MANA but ultimately had no choice but to seek the court’s intervention.”

With the termite season in full swing and favorable weather conditions throughout the United States contributing to a solid start to the season, the financial stakes are high, raising concerns for Control Solutions, Inc., Makhteshim’s U.S. affiliate. “We view BASF’s recent filing to have the potential to cause hardship to CSI’s existing and potential CSI customer base, especially if product is unavailable during a critical use season,” CSI’s Boyd said. “We also might anticipate severe economic losses to CSI as a result of BASF’s various attempts to confuse and disrupt the marketplace. I think it is very distracting for the industry to have this kind of issue at the height of the termite season and when the market wants to know that high quality key solutions will be available to meet marketplace demand.”

Raising the stakes even higher is the market uncertainty caused by ongoing litigation between

BASF and Makhteshim, both major players in the global pesticide market, including the U.S. structural pest control industry where Termidor, BASF’s industry-leading termiticide boasts 65 percent of the liquid termiticide market. “What is very clear is that the risk and exposure of using Taurus has increased,” Buberl said, “and with this finding the question is around the IP of the entire fipronil AI (active ingredient) not just the use patents.”

Despite the market uncertainty, both BASF and Makhteshim, along with Control Solutions, Inc., are moving ahead with their plans for the pest control industry, looking to take advantage of this year’s strong start to the termite season. “MAI (Makhteshim Agan Group) and CSI will defend their legal rights to compete in the marketplace with Taurus SC,” said Shaul Friedland, head of MAI’s Americas region.

“MAI and CSI have opposed BASF’s motion and will continue to seek all available remedies to resolve the ongoing nature of this case,” added Boyd. “In the immediate, MAI and CSI will continue its sales and marketing initiatives which started after the court ruled in our favor early last year.”

For its part, Buberl said BASF will continue to “vigorously defend” its intellectual property and “invest in innovation” as illustrated by the recent introduction of Termidor HE Copack, which features the addition of a BASF proprietary molecule that temporarily “boosts” the transport of fipronil, the active ingredient in Termidor, into the soil and creates an enhanced protection zone around the structure being treated, resulting in both labor and cost savings, as well as greater eco-efficiency. “We remain vigilant in protecting our intellectual property,” said Buberl “Providing innovative products to support customers’ success is our reason for being.”

As the parties continue to serve their respective customers, while preparing for battle in court, Judge Osteen – the same judge who presided over previous patent disputes between the two companies – held a telephone conference on May 3 to review the various steps leading up to a final hearing on the contempt motion, questioning the various parties on the need for discovery. Following that discussion, according to the court docket, he ordered MANA to file a full response brief. Once MANA responds, Judge Osteen will hold a status conference to determine whether depositions are needed or discovery is necessary to resolve the issues before the Court.

As a result, despite the positive “buzz” being generated by this year’s strong termite season, PMPs likely haven’t heard the last of the ongoing litigation between these two industry heavyweights, which have so much at stake as market conditions improve and the housing sector shows modest signs of life in the wake of the Great Recession.

(PCT May 10, 2012)
http://www.pctonline.com/BASF-Makhteshim-CSI-fipronil-lawsuit-process-patent.aspx?List_id=426

SYNGENTA FINED \$102,000 FOR MISBRANDED PESTICIDES

Syngenta Crop Protection has agreed to pay a \$102,000 civil penalty to the U.S. to settle a series of environmental violations related to the sale or distribution of misbranded pesticides through its facility in Omaha, NE, as well as through a farm supply retailer in Savannah, MO.

According to an administrative consent agreement filed by EPA Region 7 in Kansas City, KS, inspections of Syngenta's Omaha facility and a business in Chesapeake, VA, in March and April 2011 found that between March 4 and April 5, 2011, Syngenta had received 16 imported shipments of Azoxystrobin Technical, a fungicide, whose bags were not labeled with an accepted EPA label.

During a separate inspection in August 2011 at Duncan Agri-Service, Inc., in Savannah, MO, EPA found a bulk tank of Lumax Selective herbicide, owned by Syngenta, whose label was missing a required warning statement about the required use of personal protective equipment by persons using the pesticide.

The labeling deficiencies related to the two pesticides were in violation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), according to the settlement.

The sale or distribution of misbranded or mislabeled pesticides can pose serious risks to human health, plant and animal life and the environment. Without proper labeling or safety instructions on packaging, users can unintentionally misapply pesticides and may not have adequate information to address needs for first aid in the event of emergency.

As a result of EPA's enforcement action, Syngenta was required to relabel all of the shipments in question. The company has also reportedly instituted changes in its practices to prevent similar violations. (Crop Life May 10, 2012)
<http://www.croplife.com/article/27742/syngenta-fined-102-000-for-misbranded-pesticides>

FEDERAL AGENCIES SEEK TO ASSURE CONSUMERS ON PESTICIDES FOUND IN BABY FOODS, OTHER ITEMS

USDA, FDA and EPA are stressing the safety of the nation's food supply when it comes to pesticide residues, placing particular emphasis on the safety of baby food in the wake of USDA's latest report on pesticide residues found in a broad sampling of various food items.

On May 25, USDA released its 20th Pesticide Data Program (PDP) report, which provides pesticide residue results from 12,845 food and water samples covering about 30 different commodities analyzed in 2010. As in previous reports, USDA found a minor number of cases where pesticide residues either exceeded an established tolerance level or

were present on samples without an established tolerance.

But this latest report is the first one where USDA and its state partners looked specifically at pesticide residues in baby food, including green beans, pears and sweet potatoes.

While no pesticide residues were found in baby food samples above tolerance limits and only six out of 574 such samples had a pesticide residue with no established tolerance for that particular item, USDA officials have been concerned about how the presence of any pesticide residue in baby food would play out in the public arena. This contributed to a delay in the release of the 2010 results, a USDA official told a gathering of state pesticide officials at EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs' headquarters in Crystal City, Va., last month.

"The 2010 data have been ready since last year and [USDA has] run into trouble in getting it released," Martha Lamont, director of monitoring programs for USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS), which is responsible for the PDP report, told the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials' State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group.

"The baby food data seems to have caused some concern at the department ... it's a matter of how do you explain to the public that there [are] pesticides in baby food. They are at very low levels, but to a consumer, to a mother [who] is feeding baby food to a child, [such a result] is very difficult to explain," she said.

Agency statements accompanying the release of the 2010 report, along with the addition of a consumer-oriented Q&A document, seem to indicate a greater effort by federal agencies to address consumer concerns. USDA had already ramped up its communications effort for last year's PDP report after industry groups complained that advocacy groups were misusing the PDP report to mislead consumers regarding the safety of conventionally-grown fruits and vegetables.

Both EPA's and FDA's statements accompanying the release of the 2010 report last week focus almost exclusively on the baby food issue.

"The very small amounts of pesticide residues found in the baby food samples were well below levels that are harmful to children," EPA asserts in its statement.

"Based on the PDP data from this report, parents and caregivers can continue to feed infants their regular baby foods without being concerned about the possible presence of unlawful pesticide chemical residues," FDA adds in its statement.

Starting with the 2009 PDP report, released last May, USDA began featuring a consumer information section more prominently, stressing the robustness of the U.S. pesticide regulatory system. While previous PDP reports contained a section entitled "What Consumers Should Know" as part of the executive summary, in the 2009 report, that section preceded the executive summary. In the 2010 report, USDA went a step further and pulled the section out of the report completely, featuring it as a separate item on the PDP web page along with another consumer-oriented publication, "Briefing Room Q&As - 2010 Pesticide Data Program Annual Summary."

"Is baby food safe for my child?," asks one of the seven questions in the briefing room document. "Yes. Based on the data from AMS - and on EPA's assessment that the small amount of pesticides found in a few of the samples present no health risk - FDA has no reason to conclude that baby foods are in any way unsafe," the document responds while providing more details about the six baby food samples that had pesticide residues with no established tolerance.

Other findings

Overall, excluding catfish and water samples, residues above established tolerance levels were found in 0.25% of samples, continuing a downward trend from the 2008 report, which found such violations in 0.5% of samples, and the 2009 report, which found such violations in 0.3% of samples.

But the percent of samples containing a pesticide residue with no established tolerance for that particular sample has gone back up, from 3.7% in the 2008 report to 2.7% in last year's report to 4.6% in the 2010 report.

"Catfish and water are not included in these calculations because residue levels, if found, are mainly the result of environmental contamination or transfer, rather than from registered agricultural uses on the commodity," the 2010 report explains. (Pesticide & Chemical Policy, May 29 2012.)

EXOTIC TREE TERMITE CONFIRMED IN FLORIDA

"The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) have confirmed the presence of an exotic tree termite, *Nasutitermes corniger*, in Broward County."

This termite was considered eradicated in 2003 but is reemerging in Florida.

FDACS action will include FREE treatment of termite nests.

A link to the FDACS page on this species and the action to be taken is available on the UF/IFAS Pest Alert site.

The UF/IFAS Pest Alert WWW site is located at <http://entomology.ifas.ufl.edu/pestaalert/>. (PCT May 8, 2012) http://www.pctonline.com/tree-termite-confirmed-Florida.aspx?List_id=426

In-State CEU Meetings

Date: June 19, 2012

Title: Schendel's Biology & Mgmt of Filth Flies

Location: Norman, OK

Contact: Scott Brown (785)-233-3332

Course #: OK-12-075

CEU's: Category(s):

1 7A

1 10

Date: July 13, 2012

Title: OSU Lawncare MGMT

9 am to 12:30 pm Fee: \$30

Location: OK County Extension Center OK

Contact: Charles Luper 405 744-5531

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

Course #: Pending

CEU's: Category(s):

2 3A

2 10

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

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

CTN Educational Services Inc
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 June/July 2012 are as follows:

June		July	
5	Goodwell	12	Tulsa
7	OKC	23	OKC
14	Tulsa	26	Tulsa
25	OKC		
28	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

Pesticide Safety Education Program