

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



April, 2013

CHEM

- 1 OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION
- 1 EPA TO HOLD PESTICIDE CANCELLATION HEARING
- 2 EPA DECLARES PRIONS AS PESTS UNDER FIFRA
- 3 POLITICAL PRESSURE MOUNTS ON NEONICS
- 4 CORN GROWERS LARGELY NONCOMPLIANT WITH PLANTING REGULATIONS
- 6 WSSA SCIENTISTS STRESS EARLY RESPONSE TO INVASIVE WEEDS
- 8 PESTICIDE INDUSTRY KEEN TO DEPLOY NEW SEED TECHNOLOGY TO PROTECT BEES FROM CORN DUST
- 10 GREYHOUND BUS INFESTED WITH ROACHES
- 11 CEU Meetings
- 12 Online CEU Links
- 12 ODAFF Test Session Information

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

Cost of registration is \$30 if received by April 10th. Registration will increase to \$50 after April 10th. **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 for both locations. Testing will begin at 1:30 pm for both locations.

The next test help sessions will be May 30 in Tulsa.

NO CEU's will be given for this program!

OSU PSEP TEST HELP SESSION

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will conduct the next test help sessions for 2013 in April. The next test help will be at the Oklahoma County Extension Center on April 17th.

EPA TO HOLD PESTICIDE CANCELLATION HEARING

On March 6th, the pesticide manufacturer Reckitt Benckiser Inc. requested a hearing in response to the EPA's notice of intent to cancel 12 of the company's D-Con mouse and rat poison products,

averting the ban that otherwise would have taken effect on March 7th. The 12 D-Con products fail to comply with EPA's current safety standards and pose unreasonable risks to children, pets and wildlife. This is the first time in more than 20 years that a company has declined to voluntarily implement EPA risk mitigation measures for a pesticide product and requested a cancellation hearing.

While EPA is confident it will prevail in the hearing, the agency is disappointed that Reckitt Benckiser's course of action will result in continued unsafe exposures of D-Con products to children, pets, and wildlife while the hearing takes place. Of the nearly 30 companies that produce or market mouse and rat poison products in the U.S., Reckitt Benckiser is the only one that has refused to adopt the safety measures that greatly reduce child, pet, and non-target wildlife exposure to mouse and rat poisons.

Consumers should be aware that the D-Con products subject to EPA's ban may be available for sale by some retailers during the course of the hearing. For a list of the D-Con products EPA is working to ban, visit: <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/mice-and-rats/cancellation-process.html#cancellation>. EPA encourages residential consumers to use only mouse and rat products that meet EPA's safety standards. These products are effective, affordable and widely available at retail stores. For a complete list of these products, visit: <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/mice-and-rats/rodent-bait-station.html>.

The EPA's February 5, 2013, Notice of Intent to Cancel is available in EPA docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0049 at www.regulations.gov.

(EPA March 11, 2013)
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2013/dcon-hearing.html

EPA DECLARES PRIONS AS PESTS UNDER FIFRA

EPA last month formally declared prions as pests under FIFRA, a move that requires manufacturers of products designed to combat the harmful proteins to comply with data and testing requirements under the federal pesticide statute.

Prions are misfolded proteins that may occur in the central nervous systems of animals and humans and cause incurable and fatal neurodegenerative illnesses known as transmissible spongiform encephalopathies. These ailments include mad cow disease in cattle, chronic-wasting disease (CWD) in deer and elk, and Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease in humans.

EPA says its regulatory goals are to make sure that products used to reduce the infectivity of prions on surfaces are effective and safe. The rule amends EPA's regulations to include prion within the regulatory definition of a pest as well as its product performance data requirements to clarify that efficacy data are required for all products with prion-related claims. The agency has also made available final test guidelines concerning the product performance data for prion-related products.

EPA's interest in regulating prion products under FIFRA first emerged in 2003, when it learned that veterinary laboratories researching CWD -- the most common neurodegenerative prion disease in the U.S. -- were disinfecting laboratory surfaces exposed to CWD-contaminated animal tissues with chemicals not registered for this purpose.

The agency determined in September 2003 that prions fall under the FIFRA definition of a pest, a conclusion echoed in 2009 by the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel. EPA proposed rules declaring prions as pests in January 2011, a move that drew criticism from some industry groups concerned the agency was improperly extending its authority and FIFRA's definition of pests to include inanimate, non-living materials.

In response to that criticism, EPA said Congress intended a broad interpretation of the definition of pests and explained it did not believe designating prions as pests would have other implications beyond prions.

The rule, published Feb. 28 in the *Federal Register*, will enter into effect on April 29. (Pesticide & Chemical Policy, March 15, 2013 Volume: 41 Issue: 12)

POLITICAL PRESSURE MOUNTS ON NEONICS

Neonicotinoid pesticides came under increasing political pressure Tuesday on both sides of the Atlantic, as a proposed, limited ban gained momentum in Europe, and environmental groups in the U.S. significantly stepped up pressure on the EPA.

The European Commission indicated it will move ahead with its proposed ban of three neonicotinoids by appealing March 15's inconclusive 13-9 vote in favor of the ban, with five abstentions.

In the U.S., the Center for Food Safety led environmental groups and beekeepers in suing EPA in an effort to win an injunction against the use of clothianidin and thiamethoxam.

At the same time the American Bird Conservancy (ABC), unveiled the report *The Impact of the Nation's Most Widely Used Insecticides on Birds*, which takes dead aim at the EPA for failing to adequately regulate the same neonicotinoid pesticides targeted in Europe.

ABC's report sharply criticizes the agency on two policy grounds: for "a scientific review process [that is] extremely rigid and focused on a few species" while registering and reregistering the pesticides, and secondly a "disconnect" between science and regulatory actions, co-author and

researcher Pierre Mineau told *Pesticide & Chemical Policy* after a press conference in the U.S. Senate's Environment and Public Works hearing room.

The environmentalists are pursuing a three-pronged strategy to pressure the EPA to more tightly restrict the neonicotinoids, based on statements from the report's authors, environmentalists and attorneys.

The report is similar to other recent publications such as *State of the Science of Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals – 2012* in that they are a compendium of findings designed to provide fodder in the growing global political efforts to restrict use of targeted pesticides. Both reports advocate bans of the respective pesticides.

Not so incidentally, ABC's allegations that EPA failed to follow its own policies and rules governing the pesticide registration process coincide with the complaint filed by the CFS group. The civil suit references ABC's report in several of its eight claims.

Mounting pressure on EPA

The conservancy and environmentalists are lobbying the offices of Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA), chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, whose state's agricultural economy is feeling the pinch of too few honey bees to adequately pollinate cash crops, including the just-finished almond bloom. ABC also is seeking action from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and also from EPA.

With USFWS, the conservancy will make the case that endangered species are threatened by the proliferation of the neonicotinoids in water and food sources (treated seed) in an effort to bring in the agency charged with protecting wildlife from environmental harm.

In the overlap between the two environmental regulators, EPA is widely considered more sympathetic to the economic concerns of the pesticide industry and USFWL is regarded as more sympathetic to environmentalists.

It should be noted that the CFS backed off filing a suit last year to allow a joint taskforce that includes the EPA, USFWS and FDA to work out a solution. But a March 5 Pollinator Summit sponsored by the EPA, which essentially was a forum for pesticide companies to promise technological solutions to better control pesticide proliferation, was the last straw for the environmentalists who feel the EPA is ignoring them.

“We would like to work with Fish and Wildlife,” said Cynthia Palmer, the conservancy’s pesticides program manager and co-author of the report. The conservancy met with USFWS late last week. Palmer diplomatically held out the possibility of working with the EPA as well.

“Since EPA regulates these pesticides, we think we’re barking up the right tree,” in lobbying with the EPA to acknowledge its past errors both 20 years ago in registering the neonicotinoids, but also more recently in failing to broaden the scope of its screening and risk assessment methodologies, Palmer told *PC&P*.

It is perhaps telling that the conservancy was scheduled to meet at the end of the week with EPA’s Steven Bradbury, director of office pesticide programs, and not Jim Jones, who heads EPA’s office of chemical safety and pollution prevention. A year ago, Jones did meet with environmentalists to tell them that the science supporting their opposition to the neonicotinoids was not persuasive.

With the filing of the suit and publication of ABC’s report, the grounds shift to a more heated political drama and away from any attempt to reach a settlement based on science.

Jones, however, did speak with a reporter from *USA Today* on the day the conservancy report was released to say that he welcomes the report.

It is possible, if not likely, that the conservancy could join the suit against the EPA.

The conservancy’s report “basically is saying I disagree with EPA,” which the regulator hears a lot, James Aidala, attorney with Bergeson & Campbell,

tells *PC&P*. “I suspect...they may get more currency from the Hill.” Beyond those two approaches, “can they litigate? Sure,” said Aidala, who represents industry clients and downplayed the conservancy report and the threat of litigation. Aidala made his comments before the CFS and beekeepers filed suit.

(*Pesticide & Chemical Policy*, March 23, 2013 Volume: 41 Issue: 13)

CORN GROWERS LARGELY NONCOMPLIANT WITH PLANTING REGULATIONS

As many as 58% of growers in a nationwide survey were out of compliance with best management practices in 2012 when planting refuge for *Bt* corn, according to industry and EPA.

The results point to the need for industry to greatly improve implementing best management practices that apply to single-trait seed in the field if stewardship is to be relied upon in the execution of planting policies and methodologies. Two solutions cited by industry and observers are the move to seed with stacked traits, which is subject to a 5% refuge requirement versus 20% for single trait, and the growing popularity of refuge in a bag, where non treated seed is mixed with GM.

Better compliance with best management practices also has implications beyond *Bt* corn. Frequently, industry says it is implementing best management practices to address regulatory concerns, such as the current concern whether dicamba herbicides pose a drift threat to neighboring fields not planted with GM seed. In that case, industry says that best management practices will address worries about drift.

The *Bt* corn survey conducted in 2012 measured compliance with the management practice of refuge, the planting of untreated corn seed to help reduce insect resistance to pesticide traits. The worst performance was in the South, where noncompliance rates peaked at 58%. In the rest of the country, noncompliance with refuge regulations

ranged as high as 38%. (Survey results are published by EPA in a report entitled: *2012 Insect Resistance Management (IRM) Compliance Assurance Program Report for Corn Borer-Protected Bt Corn, Corn rootworm-Protected Bt Corn, and Corn Borer/Corn Rootworm Protected Stacked and Pyramided Bt Corn.*)

Regardless of geography, the poor results had industry officials - including those involved in the survey - declining comment.

Compliance was measured by geography considering two compliance measures: trait and planting methodology. Outside of the South noncompliance for farmers planting *Bt* modified seed resistant to corn borer was 33%.

Noncompliance in other categories:

- 23% for modified seed resistant to corn rootworm
- 27% for meeting border requirements for corn borer
- 38% for meeting border requirements for corn rootworm.

Poor compliance in the South may reflect the higher regulatory standard that 50% of corn be refuge when planting one-trait seed. The higher standard reflects the proximity of cotton fields that are feasted upon by the same insects that attack corn. Lowering the refuge requirement, it is thought, would accelerate resistant insect populations.

In the South, 32% of corn growers planted no refuge at all. Noncompliance of farmers planting seed treated for corn borer was 58%, both for meeting the 50% standard, and for complying with border requirements.

The survey also included an analysis of grower purchasing records to determine whether sufficient refuge seed was purchased by individual farmers. Nearly 2,700 growers whose procurement records were analyzed also received a site visit from third-party inspectors. Twenty-nine percent of this group was out of compliance with refuge planting requirements, and 57% of the 789 growers out of compliance were deemed to be “significantly”

noncompliant. (*Editor’s note: None of the officials associated with the survey contacted by P&CP’s answered our question about what constitutes significant.*)

A bright spot in the survey results is that only six growers of 1,138 found to be out of compliance in 2011 were described as significantly noncompliant a year later. That’s likely because the penalties for continued non compliance are steep. The six significantly noncompliant growers were denied *Bt* corn products from the same supplier in 2013— they’re still allowed to buy from other registrants; they also have the option of switching to refuge in a bag.

A source who wished to remain anonymous tells *P&CP* the threat of being denied the technology has gotten more farmers to toe the line. The source says for several years, farmers treated the strict refuge requirement as a joke; when they heard about the spot checks, they started taking it more seriously.

While 9% of growers planting corn borer resistant corn and 7% of those planting rootworm resistant seed planted no refuge at all as required by EPA regulations, that was a significant improvement over the previous year. In the 2011, 16% of farmers reported planting no refuge for both categories of *Bt* corn.

In a National Association of Corn Growers press release, ABSTC steering team member Nick Storer is quoted as saying they are pleased with the decline in farmers planting no refuge and says, “We will continue to focus our education efforts in areas of highest risk of insect pest resistance development in the Corn Belt, as well as the cotton growing area, where IRM continues to be important.”

Compliance vs economics

University of Nebraska entomologist Lance Meinke hadn’t seen the ABSTC report but tells *P&CP* there have been a number of farmer surveys in the past, and “everybody agrees the rate of compliance when you’re using a structured block refuge, like with the 20% refuge...has declined over time, and that’s one of the reasons that’s driven the refuge-in-a-bag

acceptance by the EPA and industry as well.” He says farmers have lost significant yield in refuge areas planted to non-*Bt* varieties, and the historically high corn prices have probably contributed to the temptation to plant inadequate refuges.

Meinke doesn’t believe the lack of compliance has contributed to resistance in target bugs. He says although it may have led to resistance in specific fields or on specific farms, “resistance has also evolved in places where people have very diligently used the refuge, so I don’t think there’s a good correlation there.”

He thinks the industry intends to move to refuge-in-a-bag technology, and that will resolve compliance issues. Although smaller seed companies that continue to offer single-gene *Bt* corn would move away from block refuges more slowly, Meinke points out the big seed companies also license the genetics to the smaller operations, and could use that to prod them into moving toward integrated refuges.

But Washington State University Research Professor Charles Benbrook says as refuge requirements are phased out for stacked *Bt* products, the risk of resistance will increase. He tells *P&CP* by email the ABSTC report “provides further data confirming significant non-compliance with refuge requirements, especially in the South. This, coupled with clear evidence of a growing corn rootworm resistance problem in the field, supports the need for immediate, emergency action by EPA covering the upcoming season.”

Benbrook also questions the accuracy of the survey results. University of Illinois entomologist Michael Gray says for the last six or seven years at extension-sponsored farmer meetings, he’s distributed “clickers” that automatically record the responses of farmers to questions. He tells *P&CP* he typically gets a 75-80% affirmative response on refuge compliance, but acknowledges farmers who attend extension meetings may not be representative of growers in general because their attendance at the meetings signals an openness to complying with stewardship requirements. That still means that

20%-25% of growers attending extension compliance meetings are non compliant.

“I think in some cases where there’s a lack of compliance, there may be some unintentional confusion; that they may not clearly understand,” he says. Gray also found during January meetings that the majority of producers in attendance are using integrated refuges.

Center for Food Safety science policy analyst Bill Freese says the basic problem farmer’s face in complying with refuge requirements is the lack of conventional corn seed; he notes the report identifies unavailability of preferred non-*Bt* hybrids among reasons given by surveyed producers for non-compliance. “It’s very difficult to find good quality, non-*Bt* corn these days,” Freese tells *P&CP*. “Monsanto and the other firms are phasing out the high-quality conventional seeds that farmers need to meet refuge requirements,” because, he says, those seeds are not profitable. He doesn’t think a shift to refuge-in-a-bag will compel seed companies to improve the quality of conventionally bred varieties, since they will only constitute 5% of the mix and will not have much of an impact on overall yields.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, March 29, 2013
Volume: 41 Issue: 14)

WSSA SCIENTISTS STRESS EARLY RESPONSE TO INVASIVE WEEDS

Over the past decade, dozens of “early detection, rapid response” initiatives have been launched by states to keep invasive species from devastating natural habitats and damaging our economy. Many of these programs use mobile apps and online databases to revolutionize how we collect data on harmful invaders – making it easier to map infestations and to share information broadly.

But scientists with the Weed Science Society of America (WSSA) say one part of the equation is missing: We often fail to take

prompt, effective action based on what we learn, despite the advantages of early intervention. Studies show that small, newly established invasive weed populations can expand at rates of up to 60% per year. As the size of the infestation increases, the cost of control soars while the probability of successful management plummets.

“Early detection creates opportunities for us to make smart decisions and eradicate new invasive weeds before they spread widely and become entrenched,” says John Jachetta, Ph.D., chair of the Indiana Invasive Species Council and a member of the WSSA Science Policy Committee. “In those early stages, control efforts are typically easier, more successful and far more cost effective.”

Unfortunately there are many examples of a known infestation unfolding without early intervention. One of those involves common crupina (*Crupina vulgaris*), a noxious weed in the sunflower family that can ruin valuable pastures and prairies.

A native of Europe, common crupina was first discovered in the U.S. in Idaho in 1969. But there were no concerted efforts to destroy that small initial infestation. A decade later, the weed covered many thousands of acres and had earned a Federal Noxious Weed designation. Only then did research get underway to explore the possibility of eradicating the plant.

It took years, though, to complete a study, and years more to convene a task force to review the study results. By then common crupina had spread well beyond Idaho into other neighboring states – making true eradication a very costly, time consuming and unlikely proposition.

There are also examples, though, of a more effective approach. Some states and municipalities have launched action-oriented “early detection, rapid response” programs that are producing impressive results.

In California, early detection and early response prevented a potential environmental disaster triggered by “killer algae” (*Caulerpa taxifolia*). A native of Europe, killer algae is a prolific producer of a chemical that is toxic to fish and other organisms. It also is easily spread since small pieces of the plant can break free and grow into new colonies. Once the algae is well established, eradication is almost impossible.

In 2000, a small infestation of killer algae was discovered in a lagoon in San Diego County. Soon after, a second infestation was discovered in a nearby harbor in Orange County. Knowing the potential damage killer algae represented to fishing and recreation, multiple agencies at the local, state and federal level sprang into action and coordinated a response.

Black plastic tarps and chlorine were used to kill the algae at both sites. In addition, recreational divers were trained to spot the weed and to sound an early alarm if there were new outbreaks. As a result, what could have become a very costly problem appears to have been quickly and successfully resolved.

“We’ve long understood the value of an early response to diseases impacting human health,” Jachetta said. “It’s time to bring that same sense of urgency to our natural environment and to take prompt, effective action to stop harmful invasive weeds.”

Early Detection, Ready Response: Seven Critical Steps

An effective program for “early detection, rapid response” will incorporate these seven important steps:

1. **Identify:** Both scientists and lay people are taught to identify problem plants.
2. **Report:** Online tools make it easy to submit information on a sighting.
3. **Verify:** Scientists validate reports of suspected invasive species.

4. **Review:** Data is used to keep tabs on the geography of an infestation – where the invasive weed has been spotted and how quickly it is spreading.
5. **Assess:** Experts evaluate the risk of the infestation to natural ecosystems, crops and the economy.
6. **Establish a plan:** An integrated plan is developed for managing the infestation.
7. **Rapidly respond:** The plan is quickly implemented and there is ongoing monitoring to gauge the effectiveness of control efforts.

(Crop Life March 27, 2013)

<http://www.croplife.com/article/33573/wssa-scientists-stress-early-response-to-invasive-weeds>

PESTICIDE INDUSTRY KEEN TO DEPLOY NEW SEED TECHNOLOGY TO PROTECT BEES FROM CORN DUST

Pesticide manufacturers and farm interests shared new research and concepts with EPA this week aimed at reducing honeybee exposure to agricultural dust, but the efforts look unlikely to assuage beekeepers and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) concerned with the worrying decline in the health of commercial bee colonies across the nation.

“The things you are talking about are nice and will help, but we need financial help right now and we need clean areas where we can go with bees,” said Jim Doan, a New York beekeeper. “We can’t keep bees in agricultural areas any longer.”

Commercial beekeepers are worried that most foraging areas are laden with pesticides and remain frustrated with efforts to improve bee health and the failure of the federal government to provide meaningful assistance. EPA, meanwhile, appears convinced that meetings and discussions of best management practices can help solve the puzzle.

The issue of reducing agricultural dust -- primarily corn dust -- was the main focus of EPA’s March 5 Pollinator Summit, a meeting held in Washington

D.C., in response to data the agency received that some reported bee-kills were associated with seed treatments in airborne corn dust.

The concern is that lubricant powders, typically talc or graphite, used to reduce friction and improve planting uniformity can result in airborne dust particles containing traces of insecticides that can potentially harm foraging honeybees and their hives.

New technology promised

A representative from Bayer CropScience said the company is actively examining “the role that talc may play in these active ingredients coming out” of seed coatings and believes it may have found an alternative lubricating powder to remedy the concern.

The new product has reduced airborne dust by up to 90% in early trials, said Bill Hairston, Bayer CropScience’s director of product development.

The company has “initiated cooperation and testing with all major planter manufacturers,” Hairston told attendees at the EPA meeting. “The results that we have got back so far have been very positive.”

Bayer aims to set up a large-scale field testing program in 2013, testing on a wide range of planters and geographies on some 200,000 acres in the United States and Canada, Hairston said.

A new initiative formed by the Pollinator Partnership aims to build on Bayer’s work. The newly formed Corn Dust Research Consortium is poised to fund two research projects in the next few weeks, according to Laurie Davies-Adams, executive director of the Pollinator Partnership.

She told attendees the consortium intends to fund a project to evaluate the effectiveness of the Bayer lubricant as well as a project to develop greater understanding of the use by bees of flowering cover crops and weeds in and around cornfields during spring planting season and how this is influenced by vegetation management practices.

Equipment manufacturers at the meeting signaled their support for an international standard on field drift, while seed treatment companies suggested innovations in the pipeline could also help.

“We are looking at the implications of polymers to the seed,” said Mike McFatrach, national sales manager of Becker-Underwood BASF. “Seed coating technology is evolving to further complement the use of neonicotinoids on numerous crops.”

New coatings could be the answer, McFatrach said, but the purpose of the coating must not be overlooked.

Advocates of seed treatments in corn say the technology can increase crop yields, decrease operating costs and encourage no-till farming.

Support for use of seed treatments was echoed by farmers at the summit.

“To have it in the seed and in the ground is so much better for me as a farmer,” said Jay Lynch, chair of the Iowa Corn Growers Association.

Industry groups also pushed for adoption of best management and stewardship practices as part of the effort to protect bees.

CropLife America and the American Seed Trade Association (ASTA) are developing a seed treatment stewardship guide, designed to serve as a “resource to communicate best practices across crops and treatment segments,” said Lisa Nichols, director of science and technical affairs with ASTA.

The document would be available later this month and the trade groups will be “doing outreach for this planting season,” she added.

Unconvinced

Beekeepers at the meeting welcomed the new research and pledges of efforts to improve stewardship, but suggested more is needed in the interim.

“Improved seed coatings and seed lubricants ... that is all well and good but I think we are looking at some time in the future,” said Gene Brandi, a board member of the American Beekeeping Federation. “What are we going to do for 2013? What short-term best management practices might be available for this year to try and reduce the impacts of dust emissions in corn planting this year?”

Brandi’s questions went unanswered by EPA.

Costs for crop gains are being “externalized” on the bee industry, added Bret Adey, co-chair of the National Honeybee Advisory Board, noting that beekeepers are not compensated when they lose hives to pesticide-laden dust emitted during the planting of corn.

“We have to come up with a plan,” he said. “Last year corn was approximately 90 million acres, if we had a dime an acre put aside for bee damages that would be \$9 million. If we had a fund like that, the benefit and the cost would be borne equally.”

Peter Jenkins, an attorney with the Center for Food Safety, said best management practices are “just window dressing.”

Jenkins, whose group is considering legal action over EPA’s approval of two neonicotinoid pesticides, called on the agency to make label changes to pesticides that pose risks to bees.

“I think best management practices for this planting season ... [are] a bit disingenuous, because if you really want enforceable real, concrete protections they need to be on the label,” he said. “The label is the law, whereas best management practices are not the law. They are really just aspirational things that you want people to do but they are not necessarily going to do because they are not required.”

Is there is “some reasonable language you can see out of these discussions today” to mitigate some of the issues of concern, such as lubrication technologies, minimizing off-field dust flow, ensuring proper dust disposal and possibly restricting some uses?” he asked. “Are there label changes being considered?”

EPA Office of Pesticide Program's Director Steven Bradbury said translating best management practices into label language is "definitely one of the areas we will be exploring" but offered no timeframe for action.

"There are some aspects of this where the technology does not exist yet and until the technology exists it is hard imagine how you put that as a condition of registration or on a label even if it was appropriate," he said at the close of the meeting. "But we will be exploring the spectrum of options, with best management practices and stewardship and education and training."

EPA plans to continue to promote training "to make sure people know what the labels mean" and will hold additional meetings on pollinator health to "get ideas going" and give the agency advice, Bradbury said.

The OPP chief, however, also downplayed the impact EPA can have on bee health.

"Yes, the federal government can do its regulations and that will be something we will do and that will have an impact," Bradbury said. "But the full impact ... with some of the issues you all raised today are bigger than EPA, bigger than USDA but we are all part of coming up with solutions."

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy, March 08, 2013
Volume: 41 Issue: 11)

GREYHOUND BUS INFESTED WITH ROACHES

A Greyhound bus bound for New York City had to pull over and evacuate Friday because it was infested with roaches that dropped from the ceiling and skittered across seats and the floor, terrorizing riders.

Mothers tried to shield their children and riders jumped into the aisle of the bus as roaches bolted out of cracks and crevices, seemingly all at once, about 15 minutes after the 10 a.m. ET bus left Atlantic City, passengers told NBC 4 New York.

"All of a sudden the roaches came out of nowhere, they were on the floor, they were falling from the ceiling," said Andy Rodriguez, a passenger.

Tracy Harmon told NBC 4 New York that "people were shrieking and shaking roaches off."

"It was terrible," she said.

The bus was carrying 48 people and an unknown number of roaches, according to Greyhound.

Read more news on NBCNewYork.com

"Once the driver became aware of the situation, the driver followed procedures by pulling the bus over to a safe location and notifying our dispatch office," Greyhound spokesman Timothy Stokes said.

A second bus was sent to pick up the passengers, and they later arrived at Port Authority Bus Terminal.

Greyhound said the company apologizes and has refunded the trip for all the passengers. (NBC New York March 16, 2013)
<http://usnews.nbcnews.com/news/2013/03/16/17335402-people-were-shrieking-nyc-bound-greyhound-bus-infested-with-roaches?lite>

In-State CEU Meetings

Date: April 10, 2013

Title: Ewings Irrigation IPM Workshop

Location: Ewing Irrigation

5907 S 107th E Ave Tulsa OK

\$39.00 Registration Fee

Contact: Angi Sullivan (602)-437-9530

www.ewingeducationservices.com

Course #: OK-13-

CEU's: Category(s):

3 3A

Date: April 11, 2013

Title: Ewings Irrigation IPM Workshop

Location: Ewing Irrigation

5907 S 107th E Ave Tulsa OK

\$39.00 Registration Fee

Contact: Angi Sullivan (602)-437-9530

www.ewingeducationservices.com

Course #: OK-13-

CEU's: Category(s):

3 3A

Date: April 23, 2013

Title: ADAPCO Mosquito CEU Workshops

Location: Southeast Expo Center

McAlester OK

Must RSVP

Contact: Larry Heller (321)-377-2017

www.myadapco.com

Course #: OK-13-

CEU's: Category(s):

3 7A

3 8

Date: April 24, 2013

Title: ADAPCO Mosquito CEU Workshops

Location: James Goodwin Health Center

Tulsa OK

Must RSVP

Contact: Larry Heller (321)-377-2017

www.myadapco.com

Course #: OK-13-

CEU's: Category(s):

3 7A

3 8

Date: August 14, 2013

Title: CTN Educational Workshop

Location: Courtyard Marriott 4301 Highline Park

Blvd, Oklahoma City OK

Contact: Tommy Kezar (512)-829-5114

Course #: OK-13-

www.ctnedu.com

CEU's: Category(s):

1 1A

3 3A

1 6

1 7A

2 7B

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 April/May 2013 are as follows:

April		May	
8	OKC	6	OKC
10	Lawton	9	Tulsa
11	Tulsa	23	Tulsa
22	OKC	24	OKC
25	Tulsa	30	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.

OKC: Oklahoma County Extension Office,
 930 N. Portland.

Tulsa: NE Campus of Tulsa Community
 College, (Apache & Harvard)
 Large Auditorium

McAlester: Kiamichi Tech Center on
 Highway 270 W of HWY 69

Pesticide Safety Education Program