

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



March, 2015

CHEM

- 1 UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTIONS 2015
- 2 UPDATED REGISTRATION REVIEW SCHEDULE NOW AVAILABLE
- 2 MINIMUM RISK PESTICIDE WEB INFORMATION UPDATED AND EXPANDED
- 3 FARMERS SHIFT TOWARDS VIRTUALLY NON-TOXIC ALTERNATIVES FOR PEST CONTROL
- 4 US EPA REBUFFS CALL FOR STAY ON ENLIST DUO
- 5 LOW PESTICIDE RESIDUE FOUND IN MOST PRODUCE SAMPLED
- 5 WOMAN ON AN AIRPLANE STUNG BY SCORPION
- 5 GOODBYE TUMBLEWEEDS? USDA LAUNCHES EXTINCTION PLAN
- 6 NORTH DAKOTA OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT OF PESTICIDE LAW FOUND DEFICIENT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL
- 8 CEU Meetings
- 9 Online CEU Links
- 9 ODAFF Test Session Information

UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTION 2015

The 2015 Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program will occur April 22nd in Purcell. The location will be at the McClain County Fairgrounds located at 1721 Hardcastle Blvd. The Disposal will run from 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. rain or shine.

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.

April 22nd McClain County Fairgrounds

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

UPDATED REGISTRATION REVIEW SCHEDULE NOW AVAILABLE

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has issued an [updated schedule](#) for the Pesticide Registration Review program, covering planned reviews through 2017. Through the [Pesticide Registration Review program](#), EPA reviews all registered pesticides at least every 15 years, as mandated by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. The updated schedule gives a timetable for opening dockets for the next three years – from now through the end of fiscal year 2017 (September 2017). The schedule reflects the Agency’s plan that by October 1, 2022, all pesticides that were registered as of October 1, 2007, will have been reviewed, marking the end of the first 15-year cycle. With the exception of a small number of biopesticides, the docket openings being announced in this notice represent the last group to begin the process. With these, all pesticides registered as of October 1, 2007, will have entered the registration review process.

The updated schedule reflects the EPA’s intention to review all pesticides: antimicrobial, microbial, biopesticide and conventional chemicals. Since the registration review schedule was last updated, there have been changes to the schedule to streamline our approach to the registration review process by grouping similar pesticide cases. Dockets will be opened in quick succession for related active ingredients to make the review of similar science more efficient. For example, all currently registered rodenticides are grouped together for registration review.

The updated schedule for pesticide registration review is available online at www2.epa.gov/pesticide-reevaluation/registration-review-schedules. Go to www2.epa.gov/pesticide-reevaluation/explanation-registration-review-schedule for more information about the schedule.

For more information on registration review, visit www2.epa.gov/pesticide-reevaluation. (EPA February

24, 2015)

http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2015/regis-review.html

MINIMUM RISK PESTICIDE WEB INFORMATION UPDATED AND EXPANDED

As part of EPA’s ongoing effort to build a more user-friendly website, we have transformed our Minimum Risk Pesticides website into a new, easy-to-use format. Information should now be easier to access regardless of the type of device being used (for example, laptop, tablet, or smart phone). The new site highlights the most-requested information and has been redesigned based on historic website traffic, with a focus on stakeholders who are interested in manufacturing, selling or distributing minimum risk pesticides. Minimum risk pesticides are those pesticides that EPA has determined pose little to no risk to human health or the environment and are therefore exempted from the requirement that they be registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

In transforming the website, EPA has included more information to be clearer about the conditions that a product must meet to be considered minimum risk. It is important to note that this website does not reflect any regulatory changes or new requirements for manufacturers.

The website is organized into the following areas:
About Minimum Risk Pesticides
Conditions to Qualify as a Minimum Risk Pesticide Product
Clarifications about Minimum Risk Active and Inert Ingredients
Regulation and Enforcement of Minimum Risk Pesticides

The old Web pages will redirect to the new website, and we encourage visitors to update their bookmarks with the new URLs.

The address for the new website is:
www2.epa.gov/minimum-risk-pesticides. (EPA January 30, 2015)
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2015/minimum-risk.html

NEW BLOG POST - FARMERS SHIFT TOWARDS BIOPESTICIDES

Did you know that the use of biopesticides has more than quadrupled since 2000?

Made from naturally occurring substances derived from animals, plants, bacteria, fungi and minerals, biopesticides are used as safer alternatives to controlling pests and are frequently part of Integrated Pest Management plans.

In his new blog post, *Farmers Shift Towards Virtually Non-Toxic Alternatives for Pest Control*, EPA Assistant Administrator Jim Jones discusses the importance of biopesticides and why their increased use is good for people and the environment.

FARMERS SHIFT TOWARDS VIRTUALLY NON-TOXIC ALTERNATIVES FOR PEST CONTROL

When you've had mosquitos in your yard, you might have lit a citronella candle, or you might have used some garlic oil to reduce the number of aphids in your garden. At some point we've all done something to reduce the number of pests in our environment. When their populations get out of control they can spread and cause disease, and destroy farmers' crops.

There's a whole range of what we call biological pesticides, or "biopesticides," that are made of naturally occurring substances derived from animals, plants, bacteria, fungi and minerals – like citronella, garlic oil and acetic acid. The great news about biopesticides is that they are virtually non-toxic to people and the environment. They usually target specific pests, reducing risks to beneficial insects, birds and mammals. Even better, they're becoming more common – and that means that safer alternatives to control pests are becoming more widely available.

Biopesticides have long been used in organic farming, but their use in conventional farming is growing now as well. We created a new division

focused on raising the profile of biopesticides and helping them to get licensed. Our Biopesticides Division has registered more than 430 biological active ingredients and, in partnership with the USDA, awarded over 70 grants across the country to research biopesticides for specialty and minor crops. Our more efficient registration process for biopesticides helps keep up with demand. We're helping agriculture to shift towards biopesticides, and minimizing risks to people and the environment.

The use of biopesticides in U.S. agriculture has more than quadrupled lately, going from 900,000 pounds of active ingredient applied in 2000 to 4.1 million pounds in 2012, the most recent year for which we have data. Nearly 18 million acres are being treated with biopesticides, producing crops that are better for people's health and the planet. Many farmers use them as part of their Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs so they can rely less on higher-risk pesticides and effectively produce higher crop yields and quality with lower impact on the environment.

I'm thrilled to see a significant and steady increase in the registration of new biopesticide products as well as demand from farmers, growers, retailers and consumers. We have long been committed to encouraging the development and use of low-risk biopesticides as alternatives to conventional chemical pesticides, and our commitment and efforts will continue over time.

For more about our efforts with pesticides, visit: <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/>. (EPA, February 2, 2015)

<http://blog.epa.gov/epaconnect/2015/02/farmers-shift-towards-virtually-non-toxic-alternatives-for-pest-control/>

US EPA REBUFFS CALL FOR STAY ON ENLIST DUO

The US EPA has called on a federal court to reject a bid by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) to temporarily block commercialization of Dow AgroSciences' herbicide, Enlist Duo (2,4-D choline + glyphosate). It argues that a stay is unnecessary and unjustified. The NRDC has not shown "imminent irreparable harm absent a stay" and the court should allow "the public to benefit from EPA's registration decision", the Agency has told the court.

The EPA approved Enlist Duo in October, registering it for use in six Midwestern states. The product is intended for use on Dow's Enlist crops comprising genetically modified herbicide-tolerant DAS40278 maize and DAS68416 and DAS44406 soybeans.

The EPA, Dow, and US farm groups say that the new crops are needed to help combat growing weed resistances to glyphosate and other widely-used herbicides. But the NRDC, along with six other environmentalist groups, argue that the EPA has run afoul of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as well as the Endangered Species Act and have filed suit in the US Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals challenging the agency's registration of Enlist Duo.

The NRDC's complaint argues that the Agency had failed to consider the impacts of increased glyphosate use on monarch butterflies and had not fully analyzed the potential human health effects from the 2,4-D component of the pesticide. In a motion filed with the court last month, the NRDC contends it is likely to succeed on the merits of its challenge and says that the ongoing litigation warrants a hold on the registration.

But the EPA says a stay would be pointless. "For years now, glyphosate and 2,4-D have been used, and are still being used, in numerous herbicides registered pursuant to FIFRA's legal requirements,"

the Agency explains. "Delaying Enlist Duo's entry into the market would not halt these herbicides' present and common use."

In response to the NRDC's claims about the glyphosate portion of the Dow product, the EPA says that the registration of Enlist Duo does not "represent any new use" for the herbicide. The glyphosate portion of the product is "expected to essentially replace the glyphosate that is currently being applied to the same acreage, at the same rate, and in the same manner as authorized by the Enlist Duo registration -- thereby resulting in no new or increased exposure", the EPA explains. "NRDC is therefore hard-pressed to prove that the impending sales of Enlist Duo pose an imminent harm to the monarch."

Regarding the 2,4-D component of the pesticide, the EPA defends its assessment and says that the NRDC fails to show that it had underestimated the human health risks. The Agency argues that it had conducted a comprehensive evaluation of 2,4-D and set a maximum allowable dose at least 100-fold below the levels that show toxic effects. "Moreover, the levels at which people might be exposed are far below even the maximum allowable dose level, further assuring the protection of public health," the EPA says. "2,4-D is already used as a herbicide on corn and soybeans and NRDC presents no record data to undermine EPA's finding that its increased use will not cause any irreparable harm to human health or the environment."

Dow has also filed its own brief calling on the court to deny the NRDC's request for a stay. "The fact remains that herbicides containing glyphosate and 2,4-D are currently registered and widely available for use, and indeed glyphosate is already registered for all of the same uses in all of the same places as Enlist Duo," the company says. "Thus, farmers would be free to use the same amount of the active ingredients in Enlist Duo even if this registration were stayed." (Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, January 27, 2015)

LOW PESTICIDE RESIDUE FOUND IN MOST PRODUCE SAMPLED

Of roughly 10,000 samples of mostly produce collected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and several state agricultural departments in 2013, more than 99% had pesticide residues below Environmental Protection Agency tolerances.

The sampling was part of the USDA Agricultural Marketing Service's annual Pesticide Data Program, according to a news release.

In 2013, samples were collected and analyzed in California, Colorado, Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin.

Fresh and processed fruits and vegetables accounted for about 84% of the 10,104 total samples. Other samples included butter, infant formula, salmon and water.

Fresh and processed fruit and vegetables that were sampled included bananas, broccoli, carrots, cauliflower, celery, green beans, mushrooms, nectarines, peaches, plums, raspberries and squash.

Because the data are used mainly for risk assessments, the laboratory methods are designed to detect the lowest possible pesticide residues, even if they were well below EPA tolerances.

In 2013, more than 40% of the samples tested had no detectable pesticide residue.

Excluding water samples, residues exceeding the tolerance were detected in 0.23% (23 samples) of the total samples tested (9,990 samples).

Of those, 17 were imported and six were domestic.

Residues with no established tolerances were found in 3% — or 301 samples. Broken down, 151 were domestic, 148 were imported and two were of unknown origin. (AG Professional, December 29,

2014) <http://www.agprofessional.com/news/low-pesticide-residue-found-most-produce-sampled>

WOMAN ON AN AIRPLANE STUNG BY SCORPION

A scorpion stung a woman on the hand just before her flight from Los Angeles to Portland took off, the Associated Press reported.

Alaska Airlines spokesman Cole Cosgrove says Flight 567 was taxiing on the runway Saturday night when the passenger was stung. He says the plane returned to the gate and the woman was checked by medics. She refused additional medical treatment but didn't get back on the plane. (PCT Online, February 16, 2015)

<http://www.pctonline.com/Scorpion-stings-woman-airplane.aspx>

GOODBYE TUMBLEWEEDS? USDA LAUNCHES EXTINCTION PLAN

They may be symbols of the Old West, as familiar as cactus and rattlesnakes as images of western wastelands, but tumbleweeds are targeted for extinction by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

So much for symbolism.

The USDA has developed a biological weed control weapon to control Russian thistle. That's the less dramatic, but more accurate name for the tough, reedy, and often prickly weed that becomes a rolling, bouncing, wind-driven missile across many of the West's vacant acres.

Although tumbleweeds are widely detested in large portions of the country's agricultural treasure land, they are recognized as one of the most efficient seed distributors known to man. Their spherical shape causes them to roll and bounce across the landscape, and with each bounce and some rolls their seeds are dislodged and left to germinate the natural way.

A major downside to their performance, of course, is that they only go where the wind drives them. Pests hitching rides on the tumblers are jarred off too to inflict their own brand of misery and mayhem in new locations.

Before making the case for their nuisance, economic, and eyesore value, it is interesting to note the USDA's plan for eradication.

It is banking mostly on viruses extracted from two sick tumbleweed varieties imported from Russia and Hungary. The viruses, with names long enough to stretch around the circumference of a good-size tumbleweed, were brought to the USDA's lab in Frederick, Md. under quarantine.

In tightly controlled greenhouse conditions, the scientists exposed 64 different plant species to one of the viruses, and 89 to the other to be sure the viruses they imported are not a danger to plants other than Russian thistle (tumbleweed).

The closer other plants are genetically to tumbleweeds the more susceptible they seem to be to the imported viruses.

The USDA researchers are seeking permission now from an organization that maintains control of such materials to release the two imported viruses as biological control compounds. As picturesque (and possibly romantic) as tumbleweeds may be they are real troublemakers. When they finally come to rest - impeded by a fence, a gully, a growing crop, a building, a dry irrigation ditch, or a tree or several trees serving as a windbreak - the tumbling weeds are just a nuisance.

They can become six feet or more in height - a ball as big as a car. Dried by heat and sunshine before they dislodge and start tumbling, they become harsh, scratchy disposables, taking up large spaces in truck or trailer beds assigned to haul them away.

Once "away," wherever that may be, they become first class nuisances. Chopping, breaking, and dismantling is none too good for them.

They can gather against head gates or bridges, even go unnoticed until water flows. There they can block, impede, or divert the water as it claims title

to the channel. Its seeds that didn't get jostled off during the tumbling journey hang around their wind-driven locations to become threats to the new neighbors.

In by-gone days, burning was none too good for collections of the weeds after their tumbling days were over. But agricultural burning of any kind is not much more than a memory in most areas.

One memory that persists for older citizens is the mellow harmony of the cowboy and western musical group 'The Sons of the Pioneers.' The song "Tumbling Tumbleweeds" was one of the group's most memorable hits.

That group, while still performing, belongs to an earlier generation, and if the USDA researchers have further success, so will the weeds. (Western FarmPress, November 5, 2014)

<http://westernfarmpress.com/miscellaneous/goodbye-tumbleweeds-usda-launches-extinction-plan?page=1>

NORTH DAKOTA OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT OF PESTICIDE LAW FOUND DEFICIENT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL

A federal audit has concluded that acceptable federal inspections at pesticide-producing establishments have not been conducted in North Dakota, possibly endangering the public and the environment. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) independent Office of Inspector General (OIG) issued a report last week that finds the state lacks a state inspector with qualifications equivalent to a federal inspector who can conduct inspections on EPA's behalf. As a result, North Dakota facilities that produce or handle pesticides have not been federally inspected for 14 years, and that about 1,300 pesticide imports that have come through the state since 2011 have not undergone federal inspections.

“Without such inspections, residents in other states and locations in the United States, in addition to North Dakota, could be at risk,” according to the report signed by EPA Inspector General Arthur A. Elkins Jr.

Staff at EPA Region 8 stated that inspections authorized under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) have not been conducted because North Dakota officials do not want federal inspections in their state. FIFRA (Section 7) gives EPA inspection authority and enables the agency to take enforcement actions against facilities that are not in compliance with the Act. Failure to conduct inspections increases the risk of pesticides not being in compliance with federal law, which could result in potential risks from toxics being undetected and adverse human health and environmental impacts occurring.

In a statement issued in response to the OIG report, EPA Region 8 said that it will make sure that some state inspectors are federally certified, but that the report from OIG “does not present an accurate or complete picture of the intensity of pesticides oversight and inspection activity conducted in the state.”

The OIG report has angered North Dakota Agriculture Commissioner Doug Goehring, who says the state is being treated unfairly by the federal agency.

“They don’t seem to understand or realize how you need to operate in the real world,” he said.

North Dakota’s Agriculture Department handles inspections of pesticide handlers in partnership with EPA, and receives funding from the federal agency for that work. However, the OIG report concluded that the agency should not accept “the state’s preference that federal inspections not be carried out in North Dakota.” The report adds that 14 years have passed since acceptable inspections of pesticide facilities in North Dakota have occurred. Mr. Goehring, on the other hand, asserts that about 680 proper inspections have been conducted in that time.

OIG recommends that the regional EPA office immediately begin handling inspections of pesticide

handlers and imports in the state, or have them done by North Dakota inspectors with federal credentials. The state has not had a federally credentialed inspector since the last one retired two years ago.

The report “notes a specific concern with having inspectors operating in the state that are federally certified, and this is a concern that EPA Region 8 has committed to remedy as we move forward,” the regional office said in its statement. “It is worth noting that the state had a federally certified inspector on staff until their retirement in 2013 and is in the process of obtaining federal credentials for two state inspectors.”

Mr. Goehring said inspections of pesticide facilities handled by his office meet or exceed federal standards, and import inspections at the U.S.-Canada border have always been a federal responsibility, though the state has assisted when asked.

The regional EPA office said the OIG report “presents an incomplete picture of EPA activity” when it comes to import inspections. Mr. Goehring plans to consult with the regional EPA office and get federal credentials for at least one state inspector. (Beyond Pesticides March 5, 2015) <http://www.beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/?p=15113>

In-State and Neighboring State CEU Meetings

Date: March 10, 2015

Title: Pest Management in the Food Industry
Location: Little Rock AR
Contact: Deborah Murphy (913) 397-1185
Course #: OK-14-163
www.fisaconsulting.com

CEU's:	Category(s):
4	7A
2	7C
2	10

Date: March 11, 2015

Title: 2015 SW Lawn Care Management Workshop
Location: Stephens Co. Fairgrounds Duncan OK
Contact: Max Gallaway (580) 255-0510
Course #: OK-15-019

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	3A
2	6
3	10

Date: March 11, 2015

Title: Transland Fly-In
Location: Wichita Falls TX
Contact: Bob Payton 940-687-1100
Course #: OK-15-

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	A

Date: March 13, 2015

Title: Oklahoma Invasive Species Conference
Location: National Weather Center Norman OK
Contact: Priscilla Crawford 405-255-8106
Course #: OK-15-

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	1A
1	2
3	10

Date: March 24, 2015

Title: Target Specialty Oklahoma City Workshop
Location: Reed Center Midwest City OK
Contact: Jennifer Gonzalez
Course #: OK-15-

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	3A
4	7A
2	7B
1	8
6	10

Date: April 8, 2015

Title: 2015 CSE Recertification Seminar
Location: Salina KS
Contact: Mindi Carlson 785-827-8215
Course #: OK-15-

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	7A
8	7c
8	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://ctnedu.com/oklahoma_applicator_enroll.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 March/April 2015 are as follows:

March		April	
2	Atoka	2	Tulsa
3	Goodwell	10	OKC
10	Hobart	15	Lawton
12	Tulsa	23	Tulsa
13	OKC	24	OKC
26	Tulsa		
27	OKC		

Altus: SW Research & Extension Center
 16721 US HWY 283

Atoka: KIAMICHI TECH CENTER 1301
 W Liberty Rd, Seminar Center

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,
 920 S. Sheridan Road.

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

OKC: OSU OKC Room ARC 196,
 400 N. Portland. (New Location)

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

**Pesticide Safety
 Education Program**