

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



September, 2012

CHEM

- 1 FUMIGATION WORKSHOPS
- 1 OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION
- 2 SEPTEMBER FUMIGATION PRACTICAL
- 2 NEW ODAFF CEU REQUEST FORM
- 2 AZINPHOS-METHYL USES
CANCELLATION
- 3 MASSACHUSETTS MOSQUITO SPRAYING
COMPLAINT COULD SPAWN FIRST NPDES
LAWSUIT, INDUSTRY SAYS
- 5 REPORT: 2,4-D RESISTANCE COULD LIMIT
HERBICIDE'S FUTURE USEFULNESS
- 5 JUDGE HALTS PLANTING OF GE CANOLA
IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY
- 7 CEU Meetings
- 8 Online CEU Links
- 9 ODAFF Test Session Information
- 10 ODAFF CEU Form

OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program next test help session will be October 1st in Oklahoma City. The meetings will be held at the Oklahoma County Extension Center 930 N Portland.

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 September 24th. Registration will increase to \$50 after by September 24th 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. The last test help for 2012 will be November 27th in Tulsa.

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!

FUMIGATION WORKSHOPS

Fumigation Workshops will be held September 26 & 27 in Stillwater at the Stored Products Research and Education Center (SPREC) from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. **This is a one day program and applicators have their choice of date to attend.** The registration cost is \$75 by September 14 and then goes to \$100 after September 14 or on-site. CEU's are pending. For more information contact Dr. Carol Jones at 405-744-6667. Or go to <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm> to enroll on-line (PSEP)

SEPTEMBER FUMIGATION PRACTICAL

The last fumigation practical for 2012 will be held on September 25. The program will be held at the Store Products Research Education Center (SPREC) in Stillwater. The program will run from 8 am to 5 pm.

Attendees must have passed the core exam plus the written 7C Fumigation exam before attending the practical school. Only the practical exam will be given on September 25.

Registration cost is \$200 (\$175 for OARA members) which includes the testing fee. Registration deadline is September 20th 2012. You can find registration forms or register online at <http://pested.okstate.edu/practical.htm>. Please contact Charles Luper or Kevin Shelton at 405-744-5531 for any questions. (PSEP)

NEW ODAFF CEU REQUEST FORM

ODAFF has implemented a new CEU request when applying for CEU credit for a program. All future requests for CEU's should be sent to ODAFF using this form. This allows all programs to be evaluated in a uniform and timely matter without extra requests for extra information before CEU's can be assigned. Images of the new form are attached to the end of this newsletter. If you have any questions on the form contact ODAFF or the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program. The form can be found at ODAFF's webpage and is linked on the OSU PSEP webpage at <http://pested.okstate.edu> (PSEP)

AZINPHOS-METHYL USES CANCELLATION

After considering comments from growers and other stakeholders, EPA has completed a final risk-benefit analysis for the remaining uses of the organophosphate insecticide azinphos-methyl (AZM). AZM can present health risks to workers and can cause negative ecological impacts, while effective alternatives to this insecticide are available to growers. EPA has decided to maintain the September 30, 2012, effective date for cancellation of the remaining uses of AZM, on apples, blueberries, sweet and tart cherries, parsley, and pears.

Due to unusual bad weather conditions in 2012, EPA will modify the cancellation order to allow growers to use only existing stocks of AZM in their possession for another year, through September 30, 2013. All the required mitigation measures now reflected on AZM labeling will remain in effect during this use. Distribution or sale of AZM after September 30, 2012, remains prohibited. This decision will not result in greater use of AZM than originally anticipated, and provides a safer alternative to disposal arrangements.

First registered in 1959, AZM has been used to control insect pests on a wide variety of agricultural crops and on ornamentals, tobacco, and trees. In the late 1990s, EPA began reevaluating AZM with the full involvement of a wide range of stakeholders. In 2001, certain uses were immediately canceled or phased out over a four-year period because of concerns regarding worker health and negative ecological impacts.

In 2006, EPA announced a final decision to phase out the remaining ten AZM uses in three phases, with the last uses ending September 30, 2012. This phase-out helped facilitate the transition to safer alternatives, and includes mitigation measures such

as reduced application rates and buffer zones around water bodies and occupied dwellings. In July 2012, EPA released and sought comment on an updated grower impacts assessment for the remaining uses of AZM, which has been useful to the agency in developing this final decision on AZM.

EPA's final AZM risk-benefit analysis will be available on the azinphos-methyl page in Chemical Search (www.epa.gov/pesticides/chemicalsearch/) and in docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0365 at www.regulations.gov. Further information is available in AZM docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0061 at [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). (EPA August 30, 2012 http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2012/azinphos-methyl.html)

MASSACHUSETTS MOSQUITO SPRAYING COMPLAINT COULD SPAWN FIRST NPDES LAWSUIT, INDUSTRY SAYS

The first citizen lawsuit against a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit appears to be in the works.

Industry groups have long forewarned that a barrage of citizen lawsuits would be filed as a result of the controversial new permitting requirement, required after the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in 2009 that pesticide applications to, over or near waters of the United States should be permitting under the Clean Water Act. The new permitting rules came into full force in February.

The four-page complaint (bit.ly/R0osJC), filed July 23 by the advocacy group Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER), asks the EPA Office of Inspector General for an

investigation into an emergency exemption for aerial mosquito spraying in Massachusetts.

The complaint is not a lawsuit yet, but it is the first “legal-like action” that Rebecca Adcock, senior director of regulatory affairs at CropLife America, says she has seen on NPDES pesticide permits. Adcock says CropLife expects plenty more such lawsuits are on their way.

“It is absolutely not something we’re surprised by, it is basically what we’ve warned people was going to happen with this ‘no big deal permit,’ as the activist community would have you believe,” Adcock says.

Keith Menchey, manager of science and environmental issues at the National Cotton Council, also tells *P&CP* the complaint would seem to be “the first part of litigation.”

The PEER complaint alleges the Massachusetts Department of Public Health avoided compliance with the NPDES permit program by declaring a mosquito pest emergency on July 17 for eastern equine encephalitis (EEE), a deadly mosquito-borne virus, despite knowing for weeks that it would need to conduct aerial spraying.

Kyla Bennett, director of the PEER New England chapter and the author of the complaint, tells *P&CP* that while they have only filed a complaint so far with the OIG, “that’s not to say that we won’t submit a lawsuit,” she says.

For now she is hoping to prompt EPA to review the way it is implementing NPDES permitting, adding that in her view, “nothing has changed” since the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals ruling. Soon after declaring an emergency exemption, the state conducted aerial mosquito spraying on 400,000 acres in the state from July 20 to 23.

PEER says “EPA Region 1 is complicit in this evasion of the law,” as EPA is responsible for NPDES permitting in Massachusetts and on July 31 approved the state’s pesticide application permit. Since then the state has conducted additional aerial mosquito spraying, on Aug. 13 to 14.

Bennett says EPA’s approval of the permit “was basically just a rubber stamping.” She says Massachusetts DPH’s permit application was “all smoke and mirrors” and did not consider alternatives to spraying or even whether spraying in a forested area could actually kill enough mosquitoes to reduce the risk of EEE.

It was widely known in the months leading up to the July spraying that it would be a bad year for mosquitoes, based on the mild winter and the weather, Bennett says.

“[The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection] knew it, EPA knew it — you’d have to be stupid not to — and then they waited until they declared an emergency and then sprayed without an NPDES permit,” Bennett says.

Bennett says aerial spraying of chemicals isn’t a good way to deal with EEE, as it provides a false sense of security and also exposes the public to chemicals that are possible carcinogens. She says the state would be better served by focusing on preventative measures, such as encouraging residents to apply insect repellent and larvaciding mosquitoes at their source.

An official with EPA’s Office of Inspector General tells *P&CP* that it received the complaint on July 31 and that it is reviewing the complaint. If OIG chooses not to act upon the complaint, it would then be forwarded to EPA’s Office of Water, the official says.

CropLife America’s Adcock says it’s uncertain what would happen with the lawsuit if OIG decides to act upon the complaint but says a lawsuit could potentially go forward regardless of how OIG acts.

“I don’t believe whether the [Inspector General] felt [EPA] acted within its discretion would necessarily prevent the activists from seeking further action in court,” Adcock says.

Spokespersons for the Office of Water and the Massachusetts Department of Public Health did not respond to requests for comment.

Industry reactions

Industry groups have long expected citizen lawsuits to be filed against NPDES permits, as allowed under the Clean Water Act, and many are surprised it has taken this long to see the first hints of litigation.

Menchey, of the National Cotton Council, says he personally expected the first lawsuit to be filed earlier, but notes that advocacy groups — by targeting spraying during a particularly bad mosquito season — could be taking on an issue that will not sit well with the public.

“When you’ve got 10 deaths in Texas [from West Nile virus] and these guys are fighting a protective measure, I don’t think that’s going to measure up very well in the public eye, particularly since these treatments for mosquitoes, it’s ultralow volume, less than an ounce per acre,” Menchey tells *P&CP*.

The Centers for Disease Control says in its latest update on Aug. 21 that the number of deaths in Texas from West Nile virus is actually higher, with 19 deaths reported so far.

Adcock was similarly surprised that an advocacy group seems to be pursuing the first NPDES legal action on mosquito spraying during an “uptick in every mosquito-related human health disease in this country at an almost epidemic level.”

“It’s a very interesting PR choice, but it’s their choice, and it just really magnifies in a very real and immediate way what we feared,” Adcock says.

Multiple industry stakeholders tell *P&CP* they think there has been a coordinated effort within the activist community to hold off on filing NPDES lawsuits until legislative fixes like H.R. 872 are off the table, believing that many NPDES lawsuits would bolster support for a legislative fix.

Bennett, of PEER, says she has heard of the idea that advocacy groups shouldn’t challenge certain aspects of the law because of the risks of a legislative fix like H.R. 872, but says it’s a belief to which she does not prescribe.

“I hate that argument of, ‘Don’t challenge things because they might get rid of it,’ because if it’s not being implemented properly, what’s the point of it?” Bennett says.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, August 24 2012, Volume: 40 Issue: 36)

REPORT: 2, 4-D RESISTANCE COULD LIMIT HERBICIDE'S FUTURE USEFULNESS

Even as crops resistant to 2,4-D herbicide are being developed, populations of weeds are also developing a resistance. A 2,4-D-resistant variety of the waterhemp weed has been found, and its spread could lessen the impact of an herbicide widely used in grassland and crop production. Despite worldwide use of 2,4-D since the 1940s, only 17 weeds were previously known to be resistant to it.

The journal *Weed Science* reports the discovery of 2,4-D-resistant waterhemp by a grower in Nebraska. Although scarce 30 years ago, waterhemp is now a major problem for crop production in the midwestern U.S. This is the sixth mechanism-of-action herbicide group to which waterhemp has developed resistance.

After 10 years of treatment with 2,4-D, waterhemp was no longer effectively controlled in a Nebraska native-grass seed production field. The highest doses of 2,4-D that were used in an on-site field study, 33 lb ai/A, were insufficient to control 50% of the waterhemp population.

Researchers gathered waterhemp seeds from this field and performed greenhouse testing against a susceptible waterhemp variety. Twenty-eight days after treatment with the herbicide, visual observation and dry weight values showed a 10-fold resistance in the affected sample. Researchers also found a reduced sensitivity to the herbicide dicamba.

Corn, soybeans, and cotton resistant to 2,4-D are under development; some are already under USDA

consideration for nonregulated status. While an engineered crop offers easier treatment of weeds, this biotechnology will bring about an increase in the use of the 2,4-D herbicide. The authors warn that this new biotechnology must come with proper stewardship to retain the effectiveness of this herbicide.

(CropLife August 15, 2012)

<http://www.croplife.com/article/30657/report-2-4-d-resistance-could-limit-herbicides-future-usefulness>

JUDGE HALTS PLANTING OF GE CANOLA IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY

An Oregon judge has granted a stay preventing the planting of genetically engineered canola in the Willamette Valley, saying the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) made it possible for organic farmers in that area to be seriously harmed economically should GE canola planting be permitted.

The decision involves some of the country's most fertile and sought after farmland and it comes as organic and biotech farmers work nationally to figure out how to coexist in neighboring fields.

In a three-page ruling issued Friday, Judge Rick Haselton, chief judge with the Oregon Court of Appeals, in Salem, says ODA did not sufficiently prove, in a rule it issued on Aug. 3, that GE canola seed farmers would be harmed if they were prevented from planting.

ODA, in 2009, used its authority to create a control area to keep genetically engineered canola from mixing with other specialty seed crops, but stipulated that it would review the rule at the end of 2012. On Aug. 3, the department did as promised and issued a temporary rule, to be in effect for 180 days, which would have allowed the planting of GE canola seeds in an area that extended beyond the original controlled area. ODA said it refined the

boundaries based on the recommendations of an advisory committee consisting of specialty seed growers and would-be canola farmers, and receiving guidance from the State Board of Agriculture.

Kathy Coba, ODA's director, explained the reasoning for the temporary rule in an Aug. 3 statement, saying her department didn't differentiate between "conventional and GE canola or treat them differently" because the crop had been deregulated by USDA (see *FCN* Aug. 17, 2012, Page 5). She explained, in the temporary rule, that because of that deregulation, it was up to individual farmers to work out their differences.

"Producers are encouraged to communicate with each other and work together to provide the necessary isolation to protect specialty seeds while allowing canola production," Coba said.

However, that decision didn't sit well with the Molalla, Ore.-based Friends of Family Farmers, the Washington, D.C.-based Center for Food Safety and three Willamette Valley specialty seed producers. On Aug. 15, the five organizations jointly filed suit in the Oregon Court of Appeals to seek a permanent stay of the state's temporary rule on canola, which they say would irreparably harm the state's organic agriculture production and specialty and clover seeds.

The Willamette Valley isn't just any old piece of land. The Center for Food Safety explains that it is a source of \$32 million annually to Oregon's economy, and more importantly, it is one of five regions in the world where commercial grade seeds for brassicas plants, which include broccoli, radish, cabbage and turnips, can be grown. Canola is also a brassicas plant, and therefore can easily cross-pollinate with other crops in that family, possibly harming the marketability of non-biotech seeds grown in proximity to GE canola.

On Aug. 17, Appellate Commissioner James Nass granted a temporary stay prohibiting the planting of GE canola seeds, pending the receipt of ODA's response to the plaintiff's motion for a permanent stay of the rule (see *FCN* Aug. 24, 2012, Page 7).

Two weeks later, after reviewing ODA's response, Haselton made the decision more lasting, saying his opinion was based on two major facets of the case.

For starters, Haselton says the petitioners "have demonstrated the requisite prospect of irreparable harm" if GE seeds were planted in an area that had been off-limits to engineered crops.

"The court has carefully reviewed the parties' comprehensive and detailed submissions... addressing the potential -- and vehemently disputed -- environmental and economic impacts of permitting rapeseed cultivation as a seed crop in the Willamette Valley generally and more particularly during the period of the proposed temporary rule," Haselton says. "To be sure, petitioners have not demonstrated a *certainty* of irreparable harm; indeed, some of the harms posited by petitioners may be, as intervenors and *amicus curiae* assert, merely speculative. Nevertheless, the court is persuaded that petitioners have, in the totality of the circumstances, demonstrated a sufficient likelihood of severe and irremediable harm as to warrant the requested stay."

Also, Haselton takes issue with ODA's word choice in its ruling.

State agencies are required by a section of Oregon's state law (ORS 183.335(5)(a)) to prepare a statement indicating what harm will come as a result of failing to enact a temporary rule. Instead, ODA, in its temporary rule, used weaker language that did not provide any certainty on the harm GE canola farmers would face if they couldn't plant their crops immediately, Haselton says.

ODA says, in the temporary rule, that failing to allow GE canola farmers to plant right away "*could* result in serious prejudice to the agriculture industry," the judge notes. But the use of "could" instead of "will" undermines the strength of ODA's argument, he says.

"Language -- including, and perhaps especially, statutory language describing standards of proof -- has meaning," Haselton says. "An agency's choice of language has real legal effect, far transcending

mere 'semantics.' 'Could' connotes abstract potential; 'will' connotes concrete consequences. The latter is qualitatively different - and far more demanding and rigorous - than the former. ODA employed the former, not the latter, and the court, in performing its review function, cannot deem that choice to be thoughtless or whimsical."

Fight not over yet

As might be expected, the Center for Food Safety issued a statement Friday celebrating its victory in Oregon.

"We are gratified that the court has affirmed our arguments on the illegality of ODA's temporary rule and the harm it would bring to farmers and the environment," says George Kimbrell, senior attorney for the Center for Food Safety, in a statement released Friday. "Going into the Labor Day weekend, it's a fitting tribute to the hardworking growers who have created a thriving economic engine for the state."

However, Haselton's ruling on ODA's temporary rule isn't the last word on the matter. The department must still issue a permanent rule on the same issue.

In a statement released Friday, ODA maintains that it is continuing to work on the permanent rule regarding GE canola planting in the Willamette Valley, and a public hearing is scheduled for Friday, Sept. 28, at 9 a.m. PST at the Oregon State Fairgrounds in Salem.

Leah Rodgers, field director for Friends of Family Farmers, is preparing for the next battle. "We've managed to overcome this first roadblock, but the fight does not end here," she says in a statement issued jointly with the Center for Food Safety. "Still on the table is the fight over the identical permanent rule that would change the face of the Willamette Valley, the lives and livelihoods of growers and the economic security of this state." (Pesticide & Chemical Policy, September 5, 2012)

In-State CEU Meetings

Date: September 17-19, 2012

Title: OKVMA Fall Training

Location: Norman OK

Contact: Kathy Markham (918) 256-9302

<http://www.okvma.com/Conferences/tabid/6201/Default.aspx>

Course #: OK-12-081

CEU's: Category(s):

5 6

5 10

4 3A

3 5

1 8

Date: September 20, 2012

Title: OK Nursery & Landscape Association

Location: Hard Rock Casino Tulsa OK

Contact: Becky Sellers (405) 947-6737

<http://www.oknla.org/>

Course #: OK-12-091

CEU's: Category(s):

1 2

1 3A

1 3C

1 10

Date: September 26, 2012

Title: OSU Fumigation Workshop

Location: Stillwater OK

Contact: Carol Jones (405) 744-6667

Course #: Pending

CEU's: Category(s):

Pending 7C

Pending 10

Date: September 27, 2012

Title: OSU Fumigation Workshop

Location: Stillwater OK

Contact: Carol Jones (405) 744-6667

Course #: Pending

CEU's: Category(s):

Pending 7C

Pending 10

Date: September 27, 2012

Title: Target Specialty Products

Location: Oklahoma City OK

Contact: Sylvia Kenmuir (800) 352-3870x1215

Course #: OK-12-094

CEU's: Category(s):

2 7A

2 10

Date: October 11, 2012

Title: Target Specialty Products

Location: Hard Rock Casino Tulsa OK

Contact: Sylvia Kenmuir (800) 352-3870x1215

Course #: OK-12-095

<http://www.target-specialty.com/Events/events.asp>

CEU's: Category(s):

6 3A

5 7A

2 7B

4 8

12 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 September/October 2012 are as follows:

September		October	
5	Altus	8	OKC
10	OKC	11	Tulsa
13	Tulsa	15	McAlester
24	OKC	22	OKC
27	Tulsa	24	Altus
		25	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



Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry

Instructions for Completing ODAFF "CEU Request" Application

Please read all instructions before you submit your request application. If you have questions please contact Ryan Williams at (405) 522-5993 or Debbie Mandrell at (405) 522-5949.

To receive CEU credits you **MUST** fill out a CEU Request Application. You must fill out sponsor information and course information. You must also fill out the presentation information for each presentation presented.

Sponsor and Course Information (CPS Form-CEU-1)

Sponsor Name. Enter the name of the group or entity conducting the workshop.

Contact Person Name. Enter name of person responsible for the workshop.

Mailing Address. Complete address, along with phone number, fax number, e-mail, and website if applicable.

Workshop Title. Enter the name of workshop.

Will this workshop be open to the public? Check appropriate box.

Will a fee be charged? Check appropriate box. If yes, list the cost.

Course Location. Enter the location of the workshop, address, city, state, and zip code.

Workshop Date. Enter the date of the workshop.

Repeat Date. If the same workshop is going to take place at the same location on multiple dates, enter the other dates.

**** If the same workshop is going to be held at different locations you MUST fill out a new CEU Request Application.**

Presentation Information (CPS Form-CEU-2)

Workshop Title. Enter the name of the workshop.

****Keep in mind a separate request form (CEU-2) MUST be filled out for each presentation.**

Workshop Date. Enter the date of the workshop.

Time of Presentation. Enter the time of the presentation.

Presentation Title. Enter the title of the presentation.

Summary of Presentation. Write a short but descriptive summary of what the presentation will cover.

Speaker Name. Enter the name of the speaker.

Speaker Bio. Enter a descriptive bio of the speaker presenting the presentation.

Presentation Length. List how long the presentation is in minutes.

Categories. Check the appropriate categories you wish to be considered for credit.

Please include a copy of the agenda if available.

For your workshop to be considered for CEU credit, you **MUST** fill out a CEU-1 and a CEU-2 for each presentation.

07/12



Please fill out the following form. You can save data typed into this form.



Highlight Existing Fields



Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry

Mail to:
Consumer Protection Services
Attn: Ryan Williams
P.O. Box 528804, Oklahoma City, OK 73152-8804
<http://www.oda.state.ok.us/cps.htm>

Email to:
Ryan Williams
CPS Certification & Training Administrator
405-522-5993
ryan.williams@ag.ok.gov

CEU Request Application

Sponsor Information

Sponsor Name:		
Contact Persons Name:		
Mailing Address:		
City:	State:	Zip:
Phone:	FAX:	
E-mail:	Website:	

Course Information

Workshop Title:		
Will this workshop be open to the public? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Will a fee be charged? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, how much?	
Course Location:		
Address:		
City:	State:	Zip:
Workshop Date:		
Repeat Date:		
Repeat Date:		
Please include a copy of the agenda if available. Presentation request form must be filled out for each presentation.		

CPS Form - CEU - 1



Please fill out the following form. You can save data typed into this form.



Highlight Existing Fields

CEU Request Application Specific Presentation Information

Presentation Information

Workshop Title:	
A separate request form <u>must</u> be filled out for <u>each</u> presentation.	
Date of Presentation:	Time of Presentation:
Presentation Title:	
Summary of Presentation:	
Speaker Name:	
Speaker Bio:	
Presentation length (minutes)	

Please consider this presentation for credit in the following Category(s)

<input type="checkbox"/> Aerial	<input type="checkbox"/> Nursery & Greenhouse (3c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fumigation (7c)
<input type="checkbox"/> Ag. Plant (1a)	<input type="checkbox"/> Seed Treatment (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Health (8)
<input type="checkbox"/> Ag. Animal (1b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Aquatic (5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration/Research (10)
<input type="checkbox"/> Forest Pest (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Right of Way (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Bird & Predatory Animal (11)
<input type="checkbox"/> Ornamental / Turf (3a)	<input type="checkbox"/> General Pest (7a)	<input type="checkbox"/> Timber Treating (12)
<input type="checkbox"/> Interoandscape (3b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Structural Pest (7b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Specialty Category (13)

Do not type below this line

ODAFF use only. Approved for Credit in:

CPS Form - CEU - 2