

# PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



January, 2015

CHEM

- 1 OKLAHOMA CITY HAS A NEW TESTING LOCATION FOR 2015.
- 1 2015 TEST HELP SESSIONS
- 2 EPA REVISED CHLORPYRIFOS ASSESSMENT SHOWS RISK TO WORKERS
- 3 UPGRADES TO ENDANGERED SPECIES WEB TOOL: BULLETINS LIVE! TWO
- 3 SCIENTISTS DEVELOPING PHEROMONE-LACED BED BUG TRAP
- 4 NEONIC CONTROVERSY HITS US POLLINATOR TASK FORCE
- 5 SYNGENTA GM CORN SUITS HEADED TO KANSAS COURT
- 6 CHICAGO PUTTING SUBWAY RATS ON BIRTH CONTROL
- 7 US EPA ASKS COURT TO DENY PESTICIDE DRIFT COMPLAINT
- 8 CEU Meetings
- 9 Online CEU Links
- 9 ODAFF Test Session Information
- 10 Renewal Form

## OKLAHOMA CITY HAS A NEW TESTING LOCATION FOR 2015.

ODAFF has made a location change for the Oklahoma City testing location in 2015 due to the Oklahoma County Extension office moving to a new location.

The new Oklahoma City testing location will now be located at the Agriculture Resource Center building on the campus of OSU-OKC. The address for the new testing location is now 400 N Portland Ave. Room 196 ARC.

Please be aware that seating will be more limited at this location.

## 2015 TEST HELP SESSIONS

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will conduct the first test help sessions for 2015 in February. The workshops will be held February 2<sup>nd</sup> in Oklahoma City and February 3<sup>rd</sup> in Tulsa.

The Oklahoma City Test help session will be in a new location for 2015. The test help session will now be held at the OSU-OKC Agriculture Resource Center (ARC) 400 N Portland. The Tulsa session will still be held at the Tulsa County Extension Office at 4116 E. 15<sup>th</sup>.

The help sessions will focus on information covered in the core and service tech tests. OSU PSEP will

answer any questions over other category tests during this session.

Applicators should acquire and study the manuals before coming to the help session for optimum success. Study manuals can be purchased by using the manual order form available at our website <http://pested.okstate.edu/pdf/order.pdf> or by calling University Mailing at 405-744-5385.

**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/html/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 at both locations. Testing will begin at 1:30 pm at both locations.

**NO CEU's will be given for this program!**

More Test Help Workshop dates are scheduled for 2015. Please go to the website below for more 2015 dates.

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

**EPA REVISED CHLORPYRIFOS ASSESSMENT SHOWS RISK TO WORKERS**

Today, EPA is releasing an assessment for public comment on the potential for human health risk of the pesticide chlorpyrifos.

This assessment shows some risks to workers who mix, load and apply chlorpyrifos pesticide products. When used in large amounts, chlorpyrifos has the potential to pose risks in limited geographic areas when drinking water from small watersheds. There were no additional risks from pesticide exposures in food or exposures to bystanders and workers from airborne chlorpyrifos. The latest USDA pesticide residue data show no concerns for chlorpyrifos in

food, with the pesticide detected in less than 1% of samples.

Based on the results of the risk assessment, additional restrictions may be necessary to ensure that workers who use or work around areas treated with chlorpyrifos are protected and that drinking water sources are protected. The agency will now begin work on measures to reduce these risks.

In 2000, EPA banned household uses of chlorpyrifos, with the exception of ant and roach bait in child-resistant packaging. Between 2000 and 2002 EPA cancelled the use of chlorpyrifos on tomatoes and restricted use on crops including apples, citrus and tree nuts. In 2012, EPA imposed “no-spray” buffer zones around public spaces, including recreational areas and homes, and significantly lowered pesticide application rates.

The assessment updates the June 2011 preliminary human health risk assessment based on new information received, including public comments. EPA factored in exposures from multiple sources including from the exposures from food and water, from inhaling the pesticide and through the skin. EPA considered all populations including infants, children, and women of child-bearing age. EPA incorporated information from a 2012 assessment of spray drift exposure and as well as new restrictions put into place to limit spray drift.

EPA is also assessing the ecological risks from chlorpyrifos in conjunction with the agency’s Endangered Species Protection Program; Results are expected later in 2015.

To view EPA’s revised risk assessment: <http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0850-0195>

To view related documents and submit comments, go to docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0850 at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). The public comment period will be open for 60 days, beginning the day of publication in the Federal Register.

. (EPA January 5, 2015)  
<http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/bd4379a92ceceac8525735900400c27/6b1d8a363e75a61e85257dc4006b1524!OpenDocument>

## **UPGRADES TO ENDANGERED SPECIES WEB TOOL: BULLETINS LIVE! TWO**

EPA is releasing Bulletins Live! Two, an upgraded version of Bulletins Live!, a web-based map application used to access geographically-specific threatened and endangered species protection Bulletins. This system is an important tool for pesticide users since it makes it easier to find pesticide use limitations for specific areas. Go to [www.epa.gov/oppfead1/endoranger/bulletins.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/endoranger/bulletins.htm) to view the new application. Please note, if you are using Internet Explorer and have accessed Bulletins Live! in the past, you will need to clear your history or set your browser to check for newer versions of stored pages.

Bulletins generated by the application contain enforceable, geographically-specific pesticide use limitations that are necessary to ensure using a pesticide will not harm a threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat designated under the Endangered Species Act. A reference to Bulletins on a pesticide label ensures that the Bulletin's pesticide use limitations are enforceable under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

Bulletins Live! Two has several new features, including

- an interactive map;
- different basemaps (satellite, street, geographic, etc.) to help users determine if specific pesticide use limitations apply in areas where the pesticide is intended for use; advanced
- searches for active ingredient, product (by name or registration number), location (state, county, specific address); and
- an enhanced system to receive public comments on draft Bulletins.

The new Bulletins Live! Two application is intended to replace Bulletins Live! and includes all

of the current pesticide limitations captured in Bulletins Live! including 113 county Bulletins for 10 states for the protection of 14 threatened and endangered species.

(EPA December 16, 2014)

[http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb\\_page/updates/2014/esa-blt.html](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2014/esa-blt.html)

## **SCIENTISTS DEVELOPING PHEROMONE-LACED BED BUG TRAP**

Researchers from Simon Fraser University are using a set of chemical attractants, or pheromones, that lure bed bugs into traps, and keep them there.

The Simon Fraser University husband-wife research team of biologists Gerhard Gries and Regine Gries, along with SFU chemist Robert Britton and a team of students have been working on the new trap. This month, after a series of successful trials in bed bug-infested apartments in Metro Vancouver, they have published their research, Bedbug aggregation pheromone finally identified, in *Angewandte Chemie*, a leading general chemistry journal.

They're working with Victoria-based Contech Enterprises Inc. to develop the first effective and affordable bait and trap for detecting and monitoring bedbug infestations. They expect it to be commercially available next year.

The research was funded with a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada industry grant in partnership with Contech Enterprises Inc.

The Gries began their research eight years ago when Gerhard, who is internationally renowned for his pioneering work in chemical and bioacoustic communication between insects, began searching for pheromones that could lure and trap bed bugs.

Regine worked with him, running all of the lab and field experiments and, just as importantly, enduring 180,000 bedbug bites in order to feed the large bedbug colony required for their research. She became the unintentional "host" because, unlike

Gerhard, she is immune to the bites, suffering only a slight rash instead of the ferocious itching and swelling most people suffer.

The Gries and their students initially found a pheromone blend that attracted bed bugs in lab experiments, but not in bedbug-infested apartments. “We realized that a highly unusual component must be missing—one that we couldn’t find using our regular gas chromatographic and mass spectrometric tools,” says Gerhard.

That’s when they teamed up with Britton, an expert in isolating and solving the structure of natural products, and then synthesizing them in the lab. He used SFU’s state-of-the-art NMR spectrometers to study the infinitesimal amounts of chemicals Regine had isolated from shed bedbug skin, looking for the chemical clues as to why the bed bugs find the presence of skin so appealing in a shelter.

It was like looking for a needle in a haystack.

After two years of frustrating false leads, Britton, his students and the Gries duo finally discovered that histamine, a molecule with unusual properties that eluded identification through traditional methods, signals “safe shelter” to bed bugs. Importantly, once in contact with the histamine, the bed bugs stay put whether or not they have recently fed on a human host.

Yet, to everyone’s disbelief, neither histamine alone nor in combination with the previously identified pheromone components effectively attracted and trapped bed bugs in infested apartments. So Regine began analyzing airborne volatile compounds from bedbug feces as an alternate source of the missing components.

Five months and 35 experiments later, she had found three new volatiles that had never before been reported for bed bugs. These three components, together with two components from their earlier research and, of course, histamine, became the highly effective lure they were seeking.

Their research isn’t over yet, however. They continue to work with Contech Enterprises to finalize development of the commercial lure—which means Regine is still feeding the bed bugs every week. “I’m not too thrilled about this,” admits

Regine, “but knowing how much this technology will benefit so many people, it’s all worth it.”

(PCTonline, January 5, 2015)

<http://www.pctonline.com/bed-bug-pheromone-trap-Simon-Fraser.aspx>

## NEONIC CONTROVERSY HITS US POLLINATOR TASK FORCE

The US federal task force charged with forging a strategy to improve the health of honeybees and other pollinators has been flooded with recommendations from stakeholders. But the scope of the advice suggests that the panel faces a daunting task if it hopes to craft a plan with widespread support from beekeepers, farmers, environmental groups and the pesticide industry.

Commercial beekeepers and environmentalists continue to press for stricter limits on pesticide use, including major restrictions on the use of neonicotinoid insecticides. Last week, more than 100 scientists also signed a letter urging the task force to follow the lead of the EU and impose a moratorium on the widely-used insecticides.

But the pesticide industry and key agricultural groups contend that the influence of neonicotinoids on pollinator declines is overstated. They are urging the task force to resist calls for stricter pesticide rules and to focus on other issues related to pollinator health, including lack of adequate forage as well as diseases and pests that plague honeybees.

The disparate views were on full display during two listening sessions held last month by the US EPA and the USDA. The two agencies are leading the task force, which was created by President Barack Obama in June to develop an action plan to focus federal efforts on "understanding, preventing and recovering" from pollinator losses, increase public attention and encourage public-private partnerships to address the issue.

Rick Keigwin, director of the EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs' pesticide re-evaluation division,

said that the agencies that are participating in the task force aim to submit draft reports to the White House by December 20th, with the intent to roll out a final report to the public in "late winter/early spring". But Mr Keigwin was quiet on what action, if any, the task force might take related to pesticides.

Grower groups and the pesticide industry at the listening session urged the task force to look beyond neonicotinoids. "This isn't a debate about neonicotinoids," said Bryan Tolar, president of the Georgia Agribusiness Council. "This is about the broader issue of pollinator health." Farmers are concerned about pollinator health, but do not see a direct link with neonicotinoids, Mr Tolar said, adding that the insecticides are far safer for human health and the environment than the older pesticides they have replaced.

Mr Tolar's comments were echoed by representatives from CropLife America (CLA), the National Potato Council, the American Soybean Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Seed Treatment Association and the National Association of Manufacturers, which all cautioned against new pesticide rules.

CLA president Jay Vroom said that he was focused on three issues related to pollinator health -- "the varroa, the varroa, and the varroa", referencing the parasitic mite. The CLA is still "eagerly awaiting" the summary of a varroa summit held in February by the USDA, said Mr Vroom, calling on the EPA to work with industry and beekeepers to approve new acaricides needed to treat hives for varroa.

Mr Vroom also questioned "mixed signals" from the federal government, noting the decision by the US Fish and Wildlife Service to ban neonicotinoids from federal wildlife refuges. "We have concerns about what seems to us to be a very abject and PR-motivated move to ban the use of a certain class of insecticides on Fish and Wildlife lands," Mr Vroom said, adding that it appears there are "disconnected

parts" of the federal government associated on the issue of neonicotinoids.

Commercial beekeepers, however, challenged the view that varroa is driving the declines. It is "not just varroa", said Philip Smith, a commercial beekeeper in Oregon. "We have been dealing countrywide with varroa since the 1980s and [colony collapse disorder] didn't manifest until 2006 after serious introduction of neonics. The neonics are the number one problem."

Representatives from the Natural Resources Defense Council, Center for Food Safety, Beyond Pesticides and Pesticide Action Network (PAN) also pointed to neonicotinoids as the major issue for honeybee health. "These systemic insecticides are clearly lethal to pollinators," said Lex Horan, Midwest organizer for PAN, who urged the EPA to reclassify neonicotinoid-treated seeds as pesticide applications.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, December 4, 2014)

## **SYNGENTA GM CORN SUITS HEADED TO KANSAS COURT**

Multiple class actions and lawsuits brought by US farmers and grain exporters against Syngenta have been consolidated and sent to the US District Court for the District of Kansas. The lawsuits, more than 175 in total, are all related to China's refusal to accept some US corn imports because of concerns about the presence of a genetically modified line from Syngenta.

The complaints all allege similar charges that Syngenta negligently pushed forward with commercialization of its Agrisure Viptera (MIR162) corn before it had received approval from China. The suits contend that commercialization of MIR162 has crippled the export market for corn and cost US farmers and exporters nearly \$3,000 million in lost revenues.



China has blocked some 1.5 million tons of US corn and dried grain since November 2013, citing the possible presence of MIR162. Syngenta and the lengthy list of plaintiffs were **all keen** to see the litigation consolidated, agreeing that the complaints involve common issues of law and fact. All the parties concluded that bringing the cases together into one action would be more convenient and efficient, and mitigate the possibility of inconsistent rulings.

The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) agreed in an **order** issued on December 11th. "As with past litigation involving allegedly improper dissemination of genetically modified crops, centralization will eliminate duplicative discovery; avoid inconsistent pretrial rulings, particularly on class certification; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and judiciary," the six-judge panel concluded.

Syngenta asked the JPML to transfer the litigation to the US District Court for the District of Minnesota, largely because the headquarters of Syngenta Seeds are near Minneapolis. The plaintiffs who filed the initial request for consolidation argued the cases should be moved to the US District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, noting that Illinois is the second-largest corn producing state and is home to the Chicago Board of Trade where commodity corn is traded. Plaintiffs from Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Nebraska, Mississippi, Missouri, and South Carolina all also weighed in with support for the transfer to the Northern District of Illinois.

But the JPML concluded the Kansas court was the best location. "Although these cases would be centralized in any number of the suggested transferee districts, we are persuaded that the District of Kansas is an appropriate transferee district for this litigation," according to the order. "One action and three pending potential tag-alongs are already pending in this readily accessible district."

The JPML also expressed confidence in the judge who will take control of the case -- Judge John Lungstrum, -- calling him "well-versed in the nuance" of multi-district litigation. "We are confident that Judge Lungstrum will steer this controversy on a prudent course," the panel concluded

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, December 16, 2014)

## **CHICAGO PUTTING SUBWAY RATS ON BIRTH CONTROL**

The Chicago Transit Authority plans to test new technology that would make female and male rats infertile, the Chicago Tribune reported. A pilot program is expected to start in the spring, though the CTA is still working out details including negotiating the price with the bait maker and deciding where the traps will be placed, CTA spokeswoman Tammy Chase said.

The new bait the CTA plans to test in the spring is called ContraPest, made by Arizona company SenesTech, which tested the traps in the New York subway last year. The bait, which comes in semi-solid or liquid form, is placed in a small box for rats to eat so they have a more difficult time reproducing.

[Click here](#) to read the entire article.

(PCT Online, December 29, 2014)

<http://www.pctonline.com/Chicago-rat-birth-control.aspx>

## US EPA ASKS COURT TO DENY PESTICIDE DRIFT COMPLAINT

A lawsuit filed by environmentalist groups that seeks to compel the US EPA to impose more stringent safety standards to protect children from pesticide drift is unwarranted and should be denied, the Agency says in documents filed this month with the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

The complaint in question challenges the EPA's response to a **petition** filed in October 2009 by the Pesticide Action Network, United Farm Workers and several other advocacy groups. The groups contend that the EPA has failed to protect children from pesticide drift in violation of the 1996 Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), which required the Agency to set standards by 2006 to protect children from aggregate exposures to pesticides. Although the EPA has taken several actions to further protect children from pesticides under the FQPA, notably banning use of some chemicals in the home and on lawns, the Agency has yet to impose rules to protect children from drift.

The petition called on the EPA to conduct pesticide-specific drift assessments for all pesticides with the potential to drift, and to impose measures necessary to protect children from harmful drift exposures. It also urged the EPA to immediately impose interim no-spray buffer zones for drift-prone pesticides, including organophosphates and N-methyl carbamates, around schools, rural homes, parks, daycare facilities and other areas where children congregate. The groups asked the Agency to set these interim buffer zones at a minimum of 60 ft (18 m) for ground applications and 300 ft for aerial applications.

In March, the EPA **denied the petition**, saying that its current approach for addressing and regulating pesticide drift is working and does not warrant revisions. Although the EPA acknowledged that it "shares the concerns expressed by the petitioners" about the risks from pesticide drift and volatilization to children, the Agency said that it believes the ongoing "registration review program

already in place is a timely, efficient and effective way to assess and take action on these risks".

The Agency's response did not sit well with the petitioners, who filed **an appeal in May** with the 9th Circuit. The petition for review seeks an order compelling the EPA to immediately implement the requested spray buffers to protect children's homes, schools, daycares and play areas while it is completing the revised risk assessments.

But the EPA argues that the appeal is baseless and should be rejected by the court. The decision to deny the request to immediately establish no-spray buffers "constitutes both a scientific judgment and a policy judgment by EPA as to how [the Agency] should employ its limited resources", the EPA explains in its December 3rd reply brief.

The Agency determined that the requested buffers "were not scientifically justified and not an efficient way to address pesticide drift risk, which will vary by pesticide", Agency lawyers argue. "Rather, [the] EPA determined that the most scientifically justified and efficient method for assessing and managing pesticide drift risk is on a pesticide-by-pesticide approach in the ongoing pesticide registration review process."

The EPA's decision is consistent with federal pesticide law and supported in the record, the Agency says, and the court "should defer to and uphold it".

Oral arguments in the case have not yet been scheduled.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, December 17, 2014)

## In-State and Neighboring State CEU Meetings

### Date: January 15, 2015

Title: Turfgrass and Landscape Maintenance Program

Location: Bryan County Fairgrounds Durant OK

Contact: Besty Schmitz (580) 924-5312

Course #: TBD

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

### Date: January 19-21, 2015

Title: 2015 OAAA Annual Meeting

Location: Reed Center Midwest City OK

Contact: Sandy Wells (405) 341-3548

Course #: OK-14-160

www.okaaa.org

CEU's:	Category(s):
8	A
5	1A
2	2
1	3A
2	5
3	6
5	10

### Date: February 12, 2015

Title: IFC 2015 Technical Conference

Location: Kansas City MO

Contact: Deborah Murphy (913) 397-1185

Course #: OK-14-166

www.fisaconsulting.com

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

### 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

## 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](http://www.allstarce.com)

Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

[www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm](http://www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm)

CTN Educational Services Inc

[http://ctnedu.com/oklahoma\\_applicator\\_enroll.html](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 January/February 2015 are as follows:

January		February	
5	McAlester	2	McAlester
9	OKC	5	Enid
12	Atoka	12	Tulsa
14	Lawton	13	OKC
15	Tulsa	20	OKC
23	OKC	26	Tulsa
29	Tulsa		

- 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

<h2>Pesticide Safety Education Program</h2>
-------------------------------------------------

**RENEWAL FORM TO REMAIN ON OR BE ADDED TO  
PESTICIDE REPORT's MAILING LIST**

**PLEASE PRINT - THANK YOU!**

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Company/Business Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address** \_\_\_\_\_

**City** \_\_\_\_\_ **State** \_\_\_\_\_ **Zip Code** \_\_\_\_\_

**E-Mail** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please send to:** Charles Luper or Kevin Shelton  
Pesticide Safety Education Program  
127 NRC  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, OK 74078-3033

or E-mail us at: [Sharon.hillock@okstate.edu](mailto:Sharon.hillock@okstate.edu). Please type Pesticide Report in the subject box.

If this is not returned your name will be removed from the *Pesticide Report's* mailing list.

Oklahoma State University EXTENSION personnel ARE NOT TO RETURN this form.