

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



October, 2012

CHEM

- 1 WPS COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE
- 1 UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSALS 2012
- 2 OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION
- 2 SCOTT'S MIRACLE-GRO WILL PAY \$12.5 MILLION IN CRIMINAL FINES AND CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL PESTICIDE LAWS
- 4 FTC TAKES ACTION AGAINST COMPANIES MARKETING ALLEGEDLY UNPROVEN NATURAL BED BUG AND HEAD LICE TREATMENTS
- 6 OBAMA SIGNS PRIA 3 INTO LAW, PUTTING NEW PESTICIDE FEES INTO EFFECT
- 7 SENATORS TRY AGAIN FOR 'LEGISLATIVE FIX' TO NEW PERMIT REQUIREMENTS 5 JUDGE HALTS PLANTING OF GE CANOLA IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY
- 8 STATE OFFICIALS WORRY ABOUT GENERIC 2,4-D, DICAMBA ON NEW HERBICIDE-TOLERANT CROPS
- 10 CEU Meetings
- 11 Online CEU Links
- 12 ODAFF Test Session Information

Agriculture producers and employers that fall under WPS can be inspected by ODAFF for compliance of all WPS rules. OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program can provide WPS compliance assistance if help is needed in meeting WPS regulations. For compliance assistance contact Charles Luper at (405) 744-5808 or charles.luper@okstate.edu. (PSEP)

UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSALS 2012

The 2012 Unwanted Pesticide Disposals will be held November 13th in Sayre and November 15th in Dewey. There is no charge for this program. Limit is 2,500 pounds per entity. ONLY PESTICIDES will be taken at the sites (no fertilizer, paint, oil, etc)!

If you have any questions contact Charles Luper (OSU) at 405-744-5808 or Ryan Williams (ODAFF) at 405-522-5993.

Times for all locations: 8:00 am to 1:00 pm.

Nov. 13 Beckham County Fairgrounds in Sayre
Nov. 15 Washington County Fairgrounds in Dewey

For more information please go to
<http://pested.okstate.edu/unwanted.htm>

WPS COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE

The Worker Protection Standard (WPS) is a regulation issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It covers pesticides that are used in the production of agricultural plants on farms, forests, nurseries, and greenhouses. The WPS requires you to take steps to reduce the risk of pesticide-related illnesses and injury if you (1) use such pesticides, or (2) employ workers or pesticide handlers who are exposed to such pesticides.

OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program last test help session for 2012 will be November 27th in Tulsa. The meetings will be held at the Tulsa County Extension Center 4116 E. 15th.

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 November 20th. Registration will increase to \$50 after November 20th 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.

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!

SCOTTS MIRACLE-GRO WILL PAY \$12.5 MILLION IN CRIMINAL FINES AND CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL PESTICIDE LAWS

The Scotts Miracle-Gro Company, a producer of pesticides for commercial and consumer lawn and garden uses, was sentenced today in federal district court in Columbus, Ohio, to pay a \$4 million fine and perform community service for eleven criminal

violations of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), which governs the manufacture, distribution, and sale of pesticides.

Scotts pleaded guilty in February 2012 to illegally applying insecticides to its wild bird food products that are toxic to birds, falsifying pesticide registration documents, distributing pesticides with misleading and unapproved labels, and distributing unregistered pesticides. This is the largest criminal penalty under FIFRA to date.

In a separate civil agreement with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Scotts agreed to pay more than \$6 million in penalties and spend \$2 million on environmental projects to resolve additional civil pesticide violations. The violations include distributing or selling unregistered, canceled, or misbranded pesticides, including products with inadequate warnings or cautions. This is the largest civil settlement under FIFRA to date.

“The misuse or mislabeling of pesticide products can cause serious illness in humans and be toxic to wildlife,” said Cynthia Giles, assistant administrator for EPA’s Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance. “Today’s sentence and unprecedented civil settlement hold Scotts accountable for widespread company noncompliance with pesticide laws, which put products into the hands of consumers without the proper authorization or warning labels.”

“As the world’s largest marketer of residential use pesticides, Scotts has a special obligation to make certain that it observes the laws governing the sale and use of its products. For having failed to do so, Scotts has been sentenced to pay the largest fine in the history of FIFRA enforcement,” said Ignacia S. Moreno, assistant attorney general for the Environment and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Justice. “The Department of Justice will continue to work with EPA to assure that

pesticides applied in homes and on lawns and food are sold and used in compliance with the laws intended to assure their safety.”

In the plea agreement, Scotts admitted that it applied the pesticides Actellic 5E and Storcide II to its bird food products even though EPA had prohibited this use. Scotts had done so to protect its bird foods from insect infestation during storage. Scotts admitted that it used these pesticides contrary to EPA directives and in spite of the warning label appearing on all Storcide II containers stating, “Storcide II is extremely toxic to fish and toxic to birds and other wildlife.” Scotts sold this illegally treated bird food for two years after it began marketing its bird food line and for six months after employees specifically warned Scotts management of the dangers of these pesticides. By the time it voluntarily recalled these products in March 2008, Scotts had sold more than 70 million units of bird food illegally treated with pesticide that is toxic to birds.

Scotts also pleaded guilty to submitting false documents to EPA and to state regulatory agencies in an effort to deceive them into believing that numerous pesticides were registered with EPA when in fact they were not. The company also pleaded guilty to having illegally sold the unregistered pesticides and to marketing pesticides bearing labels containing false and misleading claims not approved by EPA. The falsified documents submitted to EPA and states were attributed to a federal product manager at Scotts.

In addition to the \$4 million criminal fine, Scotts will contribute \$500,000 to organizations that protect bird habitat, including \$100,000 each to the Ohio Audubon’s Important Bird Area Program, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources’ Urban Forestry Program, the Columbus Metro-Parks Bird Habitat Enhancement Program, the Cornell University Ornithology Laboratory, and The Nature

Conservancy of Ohio to support the protection of bird populations and habitats through conservation, research, and education.

At the time the criminal violations were discovered, EPA also began a civil investigation that uncovered numerous civil violations spanning five years. Scotts’ FIFRA civil violations included the nationwide distribution or sale of unregistered, canceled, or misbranded pesticides, including products with inadequate warnings or cautions. As a result, EPA issued more than 40 Stop Sale, Use or Removal Orders to Scotts to address more than 100 pesticide products.

In addition to the \$6 million civil penalty, Scotts will complete environmental projects, valued at \$2 million, to acquire, restore and protect 300 acres of land to prevent runoff of agricultural chemicals into nearby waterways.

The criminal case was investigated by EPA’s Criminal Investigation Division and the Environmental Enforcement Unit of the Ohio Attorney General’s Office, Bureau of Criminal Identification & Investigation. It was prosecuted by Senior Trial Attorney Jeremy F. Korzenik of the Justice Department’s Environmental Crimes Section of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, by Michael J. McClary, EPA Criminal Enforcement Counsel and Special Assistant U.S. Attorney and by Assistant U.S. Attorney J. Michael Marous.

The civil case was investigated by U.S. EPA Region 5’s Land and Chemicals Division and Office of Regional Counsel, and the U.S. EPA Headquarters Office of Civil Enforcement, assisted by the Office of Pesticides Program.

More information about the civil settlement and recalled products:

<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/cases/civil/fifra/cottsmiracleagro.html>

(EPA September 7, 2012)

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/d0cf6618525a9efb85257359003fb69d/38045218faa33abe85257a72006bef1c!OpenDocument>

FTC TAKES ACTION AGAINST COMPANIES MARKETING ALLEGEDLY UNPROVEN NATURAL BED BUG AND HEAD LICE TREATMENTS

The Federal Trade Commission filed deceptive advertising charges against two marketers of remedies for bed bug infestations, who allegedly failed to back up overhyped claims that they could prevent and eliminate infestations using natural ingredients, such as cinnamon and cedar oil. One marketer also allegedly made misleading claims that its products were effective against head lice.

In one of the two cases, [RMB Group, LLC and its principals have agreed to settle the charges](#) relating to their “Rest Easy” bed bug products. In the case against Cedarcide Industries, Inc. and others, challenging their marketing of “Best Yet!” bed bug and head lice treatments, the defendants have not settled, and the FTC is beginning litigation against them.

Bed bugs have been a growing public health pest in recent years, [according to the Environmental Protection Agency](#). Consumers plagued with bed bugs experience considerable stress, discomfort, and expense in attempting to rid themselves of these pests, and many are unaware of the complex

measures needed to prevent and control them, according to the EPA.

Consumers concerned about bed bugs also should see the FTC publication, “[Good Night, Sleep Tight, and Don’t Let the Bed Bugs Bite . . . Your Wallet](#),” which urges caution about advertisements that offer quick solutions, and provides advice to consumers for treating bed bug infestations.

Also, as children head back to school this fall, the FTC urges parents to carefully research products that claim to treat head lice infestations.

In both cases, the FTC charged the marketing companies – as well as the individuals behind them – with deceptive advertising for claiming that their products can stop and prevent bed bug infestations. The Cedarcide defendants also are charged with making deceptive claims that their product can stop and prevent head lice infestations, and that the federal government endorses and is affiliated with their product.

The [Cedarcide Industries, Inc. defendants market BEST Yet!](#), a line of cedar-oil-based liquid products they claim will treat and prevent bed bug and head lice infestations. The defendants sell the product to consumers nationwide. They also sell it to hotels and other commercial establishments for treating bed bugs, and to school districts for treating head lice. Consumers can buy the product online, by phone, at the Cedarcide website, and at Amazon.com. The cost of the products ranges from \$29.95 for the quart-sized spray bottle to \$3,394.95 for a hotel-motel bed bug eradication kit.

One radio advertisement for the product stated:

“In light of the recent bed bug media frenzy that has all of us nervous, you need to know that bed bug prevention and eradication relief are available. So let’s not all freak out. All you need

is Best Yet from CedarCide.com. . . . Best Yet was developed at the request of the USDA for our military, as a solution for killing sand fleas. But guess what, it's equally deadly to bed bugs, larvae and eggs.”

The FTC complaint charges that the CedarCide defendants make:

- unsupported claims that Best Yet!is effective at stopping and preventing bed bug infestations and that it is more effective than synthetic pesticides at doing so;
- false claims that scientific studies prove Best Yet!is effective at stopping and preventing bed bug infestations, and that it is more effective than synthetic pesticides at doing so;
- a false claim that the Environmental Protection Agency has warned consumers to avoid all synthetic pesticides for treating bed bug infestations;
- unsupported claims that Best Yet!is effective in stopping and preventing head lice infestations, killing head lice eggs, dissolving the glue that binds head lice eggs (known as nits) to hair, and killing head lice and their eggs in a single treatment; and
- false claims that scientific studies prove Best Yet! is effective in stopping and preventing head lice infestations.
- false claims that Best Yet!was invented for the U.S. Army at the request of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and that the USDA has acknowledged the product as the number one choice of bio-based pesticides.

The CedarCide complaint names Dave Glassel and several companies he controls: Springtech 77376, LLC; CedarCide Industries, Inc.; Chemical Free Solutions, LLC; and Cedar Oil Technologies Corp.

RMB Group, LLC marketed Rest Easy, a liquid solution containing cinnamon, lemongrass, peppermint, and clove oils. The company sold it to retail chains Bed Bath & Beyond, Walgreens, and Big Lots, which in turn sold it to consumers primarily for use when staying in hotel rooms. The product was sold in a 16-ounce spray bottle, which cost \$6.99 to \$9.99, and a 2-ounce twin pack, which retailed for \$5.99 to \$7.77. It also was sold in a gallon jug for approximately \$50.

A video ad appearing on a company-sponsored website stated:

“Did you Know ... Bed bugs can survive up to 10 months without feeding. They can lay between 5 and 12 eggs per day ... per bug! Why take a chance on being their next meal when you travel? Or having your business shut down because somebody unwittingly brought them in? Rest Easy ... is a real GREEN All-Natural, Non-Pesticide, designed as a preventative for just these potential problems. Rest Easy And rest assured, bed bugs no more!”

The FTC complaint charges that the RMB Group defendants make unsupported claims that Rest Easy kills and repels bed bugs, and that a consumer can create a barrier against them by spraying the product around a bed.

Under the settlement, the defendants are barred from:

- representing that Rest Easy or any other pesticide kills or repels bed bugs or creates a barrier against them, and

- making any claims about the performance of such a product,

unless the representations are true and backed by competent and reliable scientific evidence.

The settlement imposes a \$264,976 judgment against the Stuart, Florida-based RMB Group, LLC, and its owners, Howard and Bruce Brenner. The judgment is suspended because of the defendants' inability to pay.

The Commission vote authorizing the staff to file the complaint against the RMB Group LLC defendants and approving the proposed consent decree was 4-1, with Commissioner J. Thomas Rosch voting no. The Commission vote authorizing the staff to file the complaint against the Cedarcide defendants was 5-0. The FTC filed both complaints and the proposed settlement order for the RMB defendants in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California on September 5, 2012. The proposed settlement order is subject to court approval.

NOTE: The Commission files a complaint when it has "reason to believe" that the law has been or is being violated and it appears to the Commission that a proceeding is in the public interest. The complaint is not a finding or ruling that the defendant has actually violated the law. The stipulated order is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by the defendant that the law has been violated. Stipulated orders have the force of law when approved and signed by the District Court judge. (FTC September 10, 2012) <http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2012/09/cedarcidermb.shtm>

OBAMA SIGNS PRIA 3 INTO LAW, PUTTING NEW PESTICIDE FEES INTO EFFECT

President Barack Obama on Friday signed into law the third Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA 3), reauthorizing for five years a structure that collects fees from registrants in exchange for predictable timeframes for the EPA pesticide registration process.

The new, increased fee structure from PRIA 3 went into effect today, the first day of fiscal 2013, and will collect \$27.8 million in annual maintenance fees, up from \$22 million under the past version of PRIA.

EPA has posted online (www.epa.gov/pesticides/fees) an outline of how the reauthorized legislation will change fees and other pesticide registration actions, including guidance on PRIA 3's new fee reduction formula, preliminary interpretation of PRIA 3 categories and other frequently asked questions.

A coalition of eight trade organizations and two NGOs have worked over the past year to get Congress to take up the reauthorization legislation, presenting a consensus proposal to key legislators in the House and Senate this spring.

The coalition made a few changes to the proposal after receiving feedback from legislators who requested a discount in certain fees for small businesses, and the legislative text of PRIA 3 made its first full appearance in the House Farm Bill in July.

Senate Agricultural Committee chair Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) introduced and passed the bill in the Senate through unanimous consent on Sept. 13, and the bill passed the House through unanimous consent hours later. The bill was presented to Obama for his signature on Sept. 20 and signed on Friday along with two other bills, a continuing resolution funding the government

through March 2013 and an extension of four immigration programs.

The Consumer Specialty Products Association, a co-chair of the PRIA coalition, commended Obama for signing PRIA 3 into law in a statement on Friday.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, October 1 2012)

SENATORS TRY AGAIN FOR 'LEGISLATIVE FIX' TO NEW PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

A bipartisan group of senators introduced legislation last week that would undo new Clean Water Act pesticide permit requirements, seeking once again to pass a so-called “legislative fix” to what industry stakeholders see as duplicative requirements that do little more than generate unnecessary paperwork and increase administrative costs.

Sens. Kay Hagan (D-N.C.) and Mike Crapo (R-Idaho) introduced the Restoring Effective Environmental Protection (REEP) Act (S 3605) on Sept. 20, the day before Congress took its long, pre-election recess. The bill would “clarify congressional intent” on pesticide regulations by exempting pesticide applications covered under FIFRA from the new permitting requirements.

But with Congress having to deal with the so-called “fiscal cliff” of expiring tax cuts and major spending cuts associated with sequestration, along with the Farm Bill and other delayed legislation, when it returns in November, even supporters of the REEP Act recognize that passing the bill is unlikely in the remaining weeks of the 112th Congress.

“It’s probably not going to be taken up in the lame duck,” Lindsay Northern, a spokesperson for Crapo, concedes to *Pesticide & Chemical Policy*.

Even so, congressional staffers on both sides of the aisle say the introduction of the REEP Act is not an empty gesture. Northern says introducing the bill is part of an effort to build up a “fairly decent coalition” in favor of rolling back the permitting requirements, with “most of, if not the entire GOP caucus” and a large number of Democrats.

The issue is attracting bipartisan support because the costs of administering the new pesticide permitting requirements puts an additional strain on resource-constrained states, staff from Hagan’s office tell *P&CP*. Additionally, if the need for environmental riders arises during the lame duck session, the legislative language in the REEP Act is one of the few issues that could be included because of its bipartisan support, say staff in Hagan’s office.

The bill includes the same legislative text of HR 872 – a bipartisan bill that passed the House in March 2011 but was blocked in the Senate by Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) and Ben Cardin (D-Md.) – with the additional requirement that EPA prepare a study evaluating the effectiveness of current regulations on protecting water quality.

Like HR 872, the REEP Act would roll back a 6th Circuit Court of Appeals ruling made in 2009 that requires EPA to issue Clean Water Act permits for pesticide applications to, over or near waters of the United States. The new permitting system went into effect in November 2011, with enforcement beginning this spring.

Advocacy groups strongly oppose efforts to undo the new permitting requirements. They argue that having the permit compels pesticide users to evaluate whether pesticide applications are actually necessary and also provide otherwise lacking information about pesticide use patterns.

The introduction of the REEP Act is partly an “educational process” because the more people learn about the new permitting requirements and its costs, the greater the support for a legislative fix, Northern says. Similarly, staff from Hagan’s office view the REEP Act as an opportunity to reintroduce the pesticide permitting issue to the Senate without the political baggage associated with HR 872.

Although HR 872, or something similar, has a slim shot at passing in the final days of the 112th Congress, supporters of undoing the new pesticide permit requirements say the issue is not going away.

“It’s almost a certainty that it will be reintroduced” in the next Congress, Nothern says. “What we want to do is keep it in front of legislative offices and their staff.”

The bill is cosponsored by Sens. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.), John Barrasso (R-Wyo.), Tom Carper (D-Dela.), Chris Coons (D-Dela.), James Risch (R-Idaho), Mary Landrieu (D-La.), David Vitter (R-LA), Mark Pryor (D-Ark), Kent Conrad (D-N.D.) and James Inhofe (R-Okla.).

State officials also favor a fix

State agricultural officials, in a meeting held this month, voted in favor of an “action item” that calls for Congress and the president “to pass a legislative fix” to eliminate the new permitting requirements, particularly in light of how these requirements have complicated pesticide applications for mosquito control.

“Vector-borne diseases such as West Nile Virus and Eastern Equine Encephalitis have heightened the public health need for urgent action to clarify that FIFRA is the appropriate statute under which to regulate pesticide applications,” the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture says in an action item passed on Sept. 13.

This isn’t the first time NASDA has taken action related to the new permitting requirements, Nathan Bowen, NASDA director of legislative and regulatory affairs, tells *P&CP*. However, with the levels of mosquito-related problems this year – the Centers for Disease Control last week said there have been 3,142 reported cases of West Nile Virus and 134 deaths – the association members “felt it was time to weigh in again and propose a fix for the problem,” Bowen says.

The problem, Bowen says, is that with limited budgets, state mosquito control officials have had to “make hard choices” between complying with the

new permitting requirements and making pesticide applications to control mosquitoes.

Another big issue, Bowen says, is liability concerns.

“When you bring in the Clean Water Act into these issues that have [historically] been regulated under FIFRA, there are increased liability concerns and folks are having to be cognizant of those concerns,” Bowen says. “Some of the mosquito districts have had to start budgeting for some of the potential legal liability.”

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, September 2 2012, Volume: 40 Issue: 41)

STATE OFFICIALS WORRY ABOUT GENERIC 2,4-D, DICAMBA ON NEW HERBICIDE-TOLERANT CROPS

Next-generation formulations of 2,4-D and dicamba that will be paired with new herbicide-tolerant cropping systems offer the promise of lowering pesticide drift and volatilization, but state officials this week shared concerns that grower contracts may not be enough to prevent the use of generic formulations of these herbicides, which are known for frequently causing off-target crop damage.

Grower contracts for the new biotech soybean, corn and cotton developed by Dow AgroSciences and Monsanto require the use of the low-drift, low-volatilization herbicides. These contracts, however, are not always followed if growers think they can get away with it, said state pesticide officials Sept. 17 at a meeting of the Pesticide Operations & Management (POM) Working Committee of the State FIFRA Issues Research & Evaluation Group (SFIREG).

“The key again for us, because we have experience with Roundup, is if there is a cheaper alternative and [growers] can get away with it ... our biggest concern is what happens when they start using the

generic,” David Scott, pesticide administrator at the Indiana State Chemist Office, said at the meeting.

Dow AgroSciences and BASF have both developed new formulations of the herbicides 2,4-D and dicamba, respectively, to minimize pesticide spray drift and volatilization — problems common to 2,4-D and dicamba that have prompted specialty crop growers to mount an organized opposition, via the Save Our Crops Coalition, to the new crops.

In the case of 2,4-D, Dow addressed many of the coalition’s concerns last week, announcing that it would amend its label to protect sensitive crops and also would collect pesticide sales and application data to find growers violating their contracts (see *P&CP* Sept. 14, 2012, Page 9).

Dow also committed to price the new 2,4-D choline salt pesticide formulation, which includes the herbicide glyphosate, so that it would be competitive with buying glyphosate and 2,4-D, says company spokesperson Garry Hamlin.

“We tried to say all along, guys don’t make assumptions about [the pricing], there’s no point in our developing technology that people don’t use,” Hamlin tells *Pesticide & Chemical Policy*.

Additionally, grower contracts do have the force of contract law, Hamlin says, and those agreements are enforced because companies want to make sure crop technology is managed properly.

“A grower will be signing [a contract] that the grower will use certain herbicides that are authorized for use with that seed,” Hamlin says. “By omission, other herbicides are not available for use. So it has the force of contract law.”

Members at the POM Working Committee meeting discussed whether EPA could do anything to prevent the use of generic herbicides with the new biotech crops. One idea discussed at the meeting was whether EPA could consider amending the generic pesticide labels so the use of generic 2,4-D or dicamba on the new herbicide-tolerant crops would be a violation of FIFRA, which can carry stiff penalties.

“Can EPA do anything like put on the older dicambas and the older 2,4-Ds, something to the effect of ‘not for use with these technologies.’ So we’re talking about affecting somebody else’s registration — not necessarily the primary registrant — to at least give us something to go on, anything that might be helpful,” Scott said.

Enforcement also an issue

One particular concern shared at the meeting is that once 2,4-D or dicamba has been sprayed, it will not be possible with current laboratory technology to tell what type of formulation the grower used, raising the possibility that state officials investigating off-target herbicide damage will have a limited ability to identify whether a grower has used generic herbicides and possibly violated a contract.

“In terms of investigations and our lab’s ability to be able to determine if it’s choline [salt] or a low-volatile dicamba, I’m not sure that we can do that,” said John Peckham, inspection and permitting unit supervisor for the pesticide and fertilizer division at the Minnesota Department of Agriculture.

The issue of enforcement continues to be a “matter of great concern” to specialty crop growers, John Bode, a lawyer representing the Save Our Crops Coalition, tells *P&CP*. The coalition, which on Sept. 21, asked EPA to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement on dicamba use related to the new crops, is “very interested” in taking steps to assure generic herbicides are not used on the new cropping systems and is also interested in getting Monsanto and BASF to make commitments that are similar to those Dow announced last week, Bode says.

“We’re very concerned about dicamba, and it would be wonderful if Monsanto and BASF were to take precautions similar to those that Dow’s undertaken, but I think we’re a long way away from that,” Bode says.

Monsanto spokesperson Janice Person tells *P&CP* the company will not authorize the use of higher volatility herbicide products in the new cropping system.

“Clear and specific label and license requirements regarding products to use, application equipment, methods and conditions will be paired with education and market-place communications,” says a statement from Monsanto. “This approach will be based on scientific research and data that determine the best ways to minimize risk of off-site movement.”

Daniel Pepitone, industry affairs manager at BASF, says the company will be strongly promoting the use of its new low-volatility dicamba formulation, called Engenia, on Monsanto’s dicamba-tolerant crops, rather than BASF’s older Clarity dicamba formulation.

“We believe that growers are going to make the choice to use the best chemistries available to them,” Pepitone tells *P&CP*. “We want them to be successful with their applications and use the best chemistries they can use.”

Jeff Birk, BASF regulatory manager, notes that while Engenia is a stepwise improvement over Clarity, Clarity is still a major improvement over past formulations of dicamba and “should not be lumped together with older chemistries.”

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

In-State CEU Meetings

Date: October 10, 2012

Title: Schendel Pest Services Cockroach Program

Location: Norman OK

Contact: Scott Brown (800) 591-7378

Course #: OK-12-102

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	7A

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

Date: October 18, 2012

Title: Agriculture Technology Field Day

Location: ½ Mile East of Wako Inc. Enid OK

Contact: Jim Rhodes (580) 227-3786

Course #: OK-12-109

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	1A
1	10

Date: October 25, 2012

Title: OAAA 2012 Operation Safe Fly-In

Location: Covington Aircraft Okmulgee OK

Contact: Sandy Wells (405) 341-3548

Course #: OK-12-104

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	A

Date: October 29-31, 2012

Title: Oklahoma Ag Expo

Location: Meridian Convention Center

Oklahoma City OK

Contact: Tammy Ford-Miller (580) 233-9516

Course #: OK-12-107

CEU's: Category(s):

7 1A

4 7c

11 10

Date: November 6, 2012

Title: APWA OK Education Day

Location: Francis Tuttle Technology Center

Oklahoma City OK

Contact: Richard Kindberg (405) 216-7828

Course #: OK-12-103

<http://oklahoma.apwa.net>

CEU's: Category(s):

3 3A

2 6

5 10

Date: November 6, 2012

Title: Winfield Solutions Fall CEU Academy

Location: Renaissance Convention Center

Tulsa OK

Contact: Amy McDonald (254)-445-4359

Course #: TBA

www.winfieldsolutionsceus.com

CEU's: Category(s):

4 3A

1 3C

1 6

1 7A

1 7B

1 8

5 10

Date: November 7, 2012

Title: Winfield Solutions Fall CEU Academy

Location: Reed Conference Center

Midwest City OK

Contact: Amy McDonald (254)-445-4359

Course #: TBA

www.winfieldsolutionsceus.com

CEU's: Category(s):

4 3A

1 3C

1 6

1 7A

1 7B

1 8

5 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 October/November 2012 are as follows:

October		November	
8	OKC	1	Tulsa
11	Tulsa	5	OKC
15	McAlester	5	McAlester
22	OKC	6	Goodwell
24	Altus	7	Hobart
25	Tulsa	15	Tulsa
		19	OKC

- 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**