PRACTICAL SCHOOLS FOR CATEGORIES 7A, 7B, AND 7C CERTIFICATION RESUMING IN JUNE

With the State of Oklahoma now in Phase 3 the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program in conjunction with ODAFF is able to resume practical schools for categories 7A (General Pest), 7B (Structural), and 7C (Fumigation) in Stillwater to complete certification for these categories. These training schools will resume in June.

New procedures for the classes will be implemented such as reducing class size to aid in social distancing, requiring faces masks for everyone in attendance, and sanitizing surfaces regularly.

To make up for cancelled classes and smaller class sizes extra dates will be scheduled to accommodate any applicators that have been waiting to attend the schools to complete certification for these categories. Practical school classes are set to begin June 9 with multiple dates scheduled. To see all the June dates available please go to our webpage at http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm

(OSU PSEP)
PESTICIDE CERTIFICATION TESTING NOW AVAILABLE IN ALL OKLAHOMA LOCATIONS

Pesticide certification exams are now available at all PSI test centers in Oklahoma. PSI is limiting the amount of tests given and following social distance guidelines.

To check for available dates and times at all locations go here. https://candidate.psiexams.com/testdate/testdate.jsp

To make a reservation go to http://pested.okstate.edu/html/new-odaff-testing-procedure or the PSI website at https://candidate.psiexams.com/

OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program also tweets out available test dates weekly on Twitter @OkstatePestEd. (OSU PSEP)

EPA RELEASES TEMPORARY GUIDANCE ON RESPIRATORY PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL PESTICIDE HANDLERS DURING COVID-19

Additional Information

The temporary guidance outlines approaches to address the unavailability of required respiratory protection and respiratory fit testing that should first be exhausted before considering any alternative options. Options include:

- Use alternative NIOSH-approved respirators offering equivalent or greater respiratory protection than those required on the pesticide label;
- Hire commercial applicator services with enough respirators and respiratory protection capabilities;
- Opt to use agricultural pesticide products that do not require respirators; or
- Delay pesticide applications until another compliant option is available.

If the above options are exhausted, EPA’s guidance provides additional options with strict terms, conditions, and exhaustion requirements to minimize potential incremental risks to workers:

- Reuse and extended use of disposable N95 filter facepiece respirator;
- Use of “expired” respirators;
- Use of respirators certified in certain other countries or jurisdictions meeting protective conditions outlined; or
- Delay the annual respirator “fit test.”

This is a temporary policy. EPA will assess the continued need for and scope of this temporary guidance on a regular basis. To read the guidance in full and to learn more about EPA’s Worker Protection Standard, visit this webpage. (EPA June 1, 2019)
https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/USAEPA_OPPT/bulletins/28e7dd5
EPA REOPENS PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON PROPOSED INTERIM DECISIONS FOR NEONICOTINOIDS

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is reopening the public comment period for 30 days on the proposed interim decisions for the neonicotinoids acetamiprid, clothianidin, dinotefuran, imidacloprid, and thiamethoxam.

EPA is taking this action to extend the comment period after receiving public comments requesting additional time to review the Neonicotinoids’ Proposed Interim Registration Review Decisions and supporting materials citing the quantity and complexity of the Proposed Interim Decisions and supporting documents, as well as addressing time and resource constraints. Upon publication of the Federal Register notice, EPA invites comments on the proposed interim decisions for 30 days. After carefully considering public input, EPA will issue the interim decisions.

EPA first announced availability of the proposed interim decisions for the neonicotinoid pesticides on Jan. 30, 2020. The proposed interim decisions contain new measures to reduce potential ecological risks, particularly to pollinators and aquatic invertebrates, and to protect public health.

Comments are accepted in docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0750 at www.regulations.gov. More information available on EPA’s proposed interim decisions for neonicotinoids.

NEW BIOTECH RULE FINALIZED

USDA announced on Thursday it is finalizing a rule to change how the agency will regulate genetically engineered (GE) crops, allowing certain crops to bypass USDA’s regulatory process in the future.

The biotechnology rule, dubbed by USDA as the "Sustainable, Ecological, Consistent, Uniform, Responsible, Efficient" (SECURE) rule, sets a standard for exempting plants from regulatory review if they meet specific criteria.

USDA released a proposed rule last summer, and also had released a proposal at the end of the Obama administration, reflecting the department has been working to revise its biotechnology rules for several years. Last year's proposed rule came out in conjunction with an executive order from President Donald Trump.

USDA stated the SECURE rule updates 30 years of regulatory process and "will bring USDA's plant biotechnology regulations into the 21st century by removing duplicative and antiquated processes in order to facilitate the development and availability of these technologies through a transparent, consistent, science-based, and risk-proportionate regulatory system."

Biotech crops are regulated under a three-pronged system in the federal government. USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection System (APHIS) regulates genetically engineered crops under the narrow focus of whether the GE plant would pose a pest risk to the environment. EPA regulates pesticides that can be applied to those GE plants, and the Food and Drug Administration oversees whether the plant is safe for food.

Under USDA's final rule, certain GE plants will not need regulatory approval from APHIS if they otherwise could have been developed through conventional breeding and have a history of safe use related to plant pest risk. Second, the rule states that GE plants will not be subject to regulation if they

(EPA May 21, 2020)
https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-reopens-public-comment-period-proposed-interim-decisions-neonicotinoids
have plant-trait combinations that are the same as other plants that APHIS has conducted a regulatory review on and approved. Other genetically engineered plants are not subject to regulations if they are greenlighted by APHIS under an inquiry process in which biotech developers query APHIS with "Am I Regulated" letters.

The rule also continues to maintain non-regulated status for crops developed using gene-editing techniques such as CRISPR-Cas9 technology, as long as they do not pose a plant-pest risk.

USDA states in the rule that the regulatory exemptions apply to plants containing single targeted genetic modifications. But the APHIS administrator may propose to exempt plants with additional modifications "based on what could be achieved through conventional breeding."

APHIS will publish a list of plant-trait combinations that have been evaluated under the new process and found not to require regulation. The agency states in the rule that the list can be used by trait developers to determine whether a novel GE plant would qualify for an exemption.

Based on its 30-plus years of risk assessments, APHIS states the agency is able to evaluate plant-pest risks of a GE organism without field-test data. In crafting the rule, APHIS stated it "conducted extensive outreach" that included meeting with more than 80 organizations, including 17 universities as well as farm organizations. The proposed rule issued last summer generated more than 6,100 comments, and APHIS responded to the issues raised in those public comments.

Many groups that commented on the rule oppose "self-determination," citing it would allow biotechnology developers to regulate themselves and could result in conflicts of interest. The financial stakes in a regulatory outcome "should not be allowed to determine which products are subject to regulatory review." Groups stated that would undermine the integrity, rigor and credibility of an independent regulatory process.

APHIS disagreed with that position, citing that their regulatory change only applies to products that do not pose additional plant risk, and "developers have always been able to act accordingly to determine whether their products are subject to the regulations."

If a plant developer makes the wrong decision in deciding their crops should not be regulated, APHIS said it has the capabilities for penalties and remedial actions, which will be applied on a case-by-case basis. The Plant Protection Act has a maximum penalty of $1 million per violation that can be used. Yet, some groups also commented about penalty violations being too stiff.

Along with that, APHIS stated the agency expects many developers whose products fall within the exemption will still request confirmation letters because the letters will help them market their products domestically and overseas.

If a plant pest comes up from a plant that is exempt from regulations, APHIS states it has the mechanisms to address it "and has a wealth of experience in dealing with such instances."

The American Seed Trade Association praised Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue and USDA for the SECURE rule. The group stated it's important for seed companies "to have a clear pathway" to request and receive confirmation that a seed product is exempt from regulatory oversight.

"All of our nation's agricultural producers deserve choice and access when it comes to the latest tools available to support the economic and environmental sustainability of their operations," said Andy LaVigne, ASTA's president and CEO. "In order for America to remain a leader in innovation, and to address very real challenges facing our agriculture and food production system -- from climate change, to rapidly evolving pests and diseases -- we need a science- and risk-based regulatory system that provides a clear pathway to commercialization for products that utilize the latest breeding, research and development tools."
The biotechnology lobbying group BIO said that, with the new rule, "government and industry must do more to build an informed and trust-based dialogue on biotechnology innovation in food and agriculture ..."

BIO added that the COVID-19 crisis shows that food and farming systems can be fragile.

"The rule released by USDA today will accelerate the development of innovations that will improve lives globally," said Dana O'Brien, executive vice president of BIO's food and agriculture section. "BIO is pleased that USDA's updated regulatory approach builds on decades of scientific knowledge about biotechnology in food and agriculture. It holds great promise to enhance investment and product development by small and mid-sized companies in particular."

The USDA final rule will be published May 18 in the Federal Register. A draft copy can be viewed here: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/....

(Progressive Farmer, May 14, 2020)
https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/05/15/usda-deregulate-certain-genetically

TEXAS A&M RECOMMENDS THE TEXAS TWO-STEP FOR FIRE ANT CONTROL

Now is an ideal time to take the first step to fire ant control, said Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service experts.

“Spring is a good time to begin your imported red fire ant control because this is the time of year when the ants are searching for food and starting to build those mounds that make them much easier easy to locate,” said Mike Merchant, Ph.D., AgriLife Extension urban entomologist at the Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Center in Dallas.

He also noted with more people stuck at home during the COVID-19 pandemic, treating for fire ants might just be a perfect task for the property owner who is ‘antsy’ to get outside.

The Two-Step Method

Merchant said the Two-Step Method is AgriLife Extension’s preferred method of fire ant control. The first step involves semi-annual broadcast applications of fire ant bait. The second involves follow-up treatments of individual mounds or “nuisance” ant colonies, such as those in sensitive or high-traffic areas.

“The two-step method is less labor-intensive, less toxic and more environmentally friendly than most other means of do-it-yourself fire ant control,” he said.

Step one

Merchant said the use of fire ant bait as the first step is effective as temperatures begin to rise and ants begin to gather forage to feed their new brood.

“Spring and fall are particularly good times to apply baits,” he said. “Once it gets hot and dry, as during the summer months, fire ants become less active and mounds become less visible as ants go deeper into the soil.”

Baits also have an advantage in that users don’t have to find the fire ant colonies, noted Robert Puckett, Ph.D. AgriLife Extension entomologist, College Station.

“Fire ant colonies can be difficult to locate, especially over a large area, so using a bait is less costly in terms of time and the amount of product needed for treating larger areas,” Puckett said. “With baits, ants pick up the bait and return it to the nest, so they do most of the work for you.”

He said the fire ant bait concentration is very low compared to residential insecticides, The amount of grains per area going by recommendations is fairly low, so it’s not necessary to use a lot of insecticide.
“The efficacy of baits may differ, but they all work pretty well,” he said. “However, the baits that work faster are also usually more expensive, so you have to weigh if the cost is worth the result.”

**Step two**

“Because fire ant mounds are most visible this time of year, especially after a rain, they are easier to locate in order to do the second step,” Merchant said. “This involves treating the largest or most troublesome mounds with an individual mound treatment, such as a liquid drench or some form of granular, non-bait insecticide or dust.”

For fire ant colonies next to structures or in high-traffic areas that require a quick control, the property owner should take step two and treat these mounds individually with a contact insecticide. Otherwise, this step is optional.

“Most contact insecticides applied directly to the mound kill the colony in one to two days,” Puckett said. “If the area has just a few mounds, then it may not even be necessary to apply bait as a first step.”

He said the most important message he can give is to follow label instructions and not try to mix too little or too much water if using a liquid insecticide.

“These products have been tested for efficacy and safety at a particular concentration, so you don’t want to guess at what may or may not happen if you vary from instructions,” he said. “Also, remember to wear the proper protection such as gloves and possibly even safety goggles if you’re mixing chemicals. Be mindful of protecting yourself and protecting the environment.”

**Community fire ant control**

While the Two-Step Method can be used successfully by individual property owners, it can be even more successful if people throughout a neighborhood work together to control fire ant colony proliferation.

That is what Wizzie Brown, AgriLife Extension integrated pest management specialist in Travis County, along with other residents of the Wood Glen community in Round Rock have been doing since 2005.

The Wood Glen community consists of 548 homes as well as a community park, green belt and walking trails.

“To my knowledge, this is the longest-running community-wide fire ant program in the state,” Brown said. “Neighbors join together to bait the entire neighborhood twice a year, and neighborhood activities include a fire ant information day during which they learn about baits and get advice on the proper application of fire ant control products.”

Getting the entire community involved also helps limit the spread of fire ant activity from one property to another, she said. The Wood Glen community recently coordinated the fire ant bait broadcasting portion of the Two-Step Method.

Brown said similar community-wide fire ant control efforts have also taken place in other primarily urban counties of Texas in collaboration with AgriLife Extension integrated pest management specialists.

“The Wood Glen program’s success has largely been due to active community involvement along with an engaged and a helpful homeowners’ association,” Brown said. “You don’t need an entomologist living in the neighborhood to have a successful pest management program. All you need is a community champion and people in the community willing to support it.”

**Proper use of fire ant control products**

According to Merchant, AgriLife Extension also developed the Two-Step Method to help consumers make sense of all the fire ant control products on the market.

“The insecticide label determines where a product can be used, whether it’s a lawn, garden,
agricultural production pasture or orchard,” Merchant said. “Users should always read the pesticide label to be sure the site they are treating is listed, then follow all label instructions.”

He also suggested the following tips for control of fire ants:

• Do not use gasoline or other petroleum products to control fire ants. Although these kill fire ants, they are highly flammable and are dangerous to both the user and the environment.

• Don’t leave insecticide granules on streets or sidewalks after application. Sweep up any excess product so it doesn’t wash into gutters or storm sewers and affect the water table.

• Always follow label directions on the proper disposal of pesticides. Do not pour pesticide leftovers down the drain as they are not easily removed by regular wastewater treatment.

“The Two-Step Method can be an efficient, effective and safe way to control fire ants for an individual home, large property or entire community,” Merchant said. (PCT Online, May 15, 2020) https://www.pctonline.com/article/fire-ant-texas-two-step-am-merchant/

MOST US SPRING WHEAT TREATED WITH HERBICIDES

The vast majority of US spring wheat crops were treated with herbicides last year, according to the latest survey data from the USDA’s National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). Some 96% of the durum wheat acreage was sprayed with herbicides and 97% of other spring wheat crops received such treatments. Those figures compare with 93% of durum crops and 96% of other spring wheat crops being treated with herbicides when they were last surveyed in 2017. Some 66% of winter wheat acres were sprayed with herbicides in 2019 compared with 61% in 2017.

The most widely used herbicide on durum wheat last year was the isopropylamine salt of glyphosate, with 339,000 lbs (153.8 tonnes) being applied to 46% of the surveyed acreage. The next most commonly used herbicide was bromoxynil octanoate (108,000 lbs on 39% of the acreage). On other spring wheat, the most widely used herbicides by acreage were fluroxypyr (526,000 lbs on 46%) and bromoxynil octanoate (721,000 lbs on 37%). The leading herbicides on winter wheat were 2,4-D (2.9 million lbs on 20%) and metsulfuron-methyl (16,000 lbs on 20%). The winter wheat survey was conducted in 15 states representing 87.4% of the crop’s acreage, the durum wheat survey took place in four states (99.6% of acreage) and other spring wheat was surveyed in six states (100%).

Barley

Some 84% of surveyed barley crops were treated with herbicides last year. The most commonly used active ingredients were fluroxypyr (106,000 lbs on 42%), pinoxaden (37,000 lbs on 28%), MCPA (183,000 lbs on 25%), thifensulfuron (7,000 lbs on 24%) and tribenuron-methyl (4,000 lbs on 24%). Fungicides were applied to 21% of the acreage and insecticides to 6%. The barley survey was conducted in 14 states representing 94.9% of the acreage.

Cotton

Herbicides were applied to 93% of the cotton acreage compared with 91% when the crop was last surveyed in 2017. Glyphosate was again the most widely used herbicide with 12.8 million lbs of the isopropylamine salt being used on 55% of the acreage and 9.2 million lbs of the potassium salt being applied to 32% of the area. The next most commonly used ai was the diglycolamine salt of dicamba (3.2 million lbs on 21%), which did not feature among the most used herbicides in 2017. Bayer legacy company Monsanto received US approval for dicamba on genetically modified cotton in late 2016. The next most widely used herbicides on cotton last year were diuron (1.3 million lbs on 20%) and trifluralin (2 million lbs on 16%).
Insecticides were used on 56% of the cotton acreage, fungicides on 3% and other chemicals on 65%. The cotton survey was carried out in 13 states representing 96.7% of the acreage.

**Sorghum**

Some 89% of the sorghum crop was treated with herbicides in 2019. The most widely used a.i.s were atrazine (4.3 million lbs on 71%), glyphosate isopropylamine salt (2.4 million lbs on 45%), S-metolachlor (2.4 million lbs on 36%), dicamba dimethylamine salt (600,000 lbs on 26%) and glyphosate potassium salt (1.8 million lbs on 24%). Insecticides were applied to 3% of the sorghum area and other chemicals to 9%. The sorghum survey was conducted in the six states where the crop is grown. (AGROW, May 15, 2020)

**50-STATE SURVEY: LIABILITY FOR PESTICIDE DRIFT**

Landowners who apply or contract for the application of pesticide may have concern over their potential liability should pesticide drift occur and cause damage to neighboring crops. Generally, lawsuits related to drift sound in negligence. However, there are two additional potential claims that may arise in these cases of which landowners should be aware. Hannes Żetzche, a third-year law student at the University of Nebraska, and I recently co-authored an article on liability for pesticide drift. The article looks at two important questions and offers the answers for each of the fifty states.

The first issue relates to whether the application of pesticides is considered inherently dangerous. This is a critical question because under tort law in most states, a landowner is not liable for the acts of his or her independent contractor. One exception to that general rule provides that landowners may be held liable for actions of an independent contractor if the action being taken by the contractor is considered to be inherently dangerous.

The second issue relates to a claim of strict liability against persons who apply pesticide. Unlike the more common negligence theory, strict liability does not consider the reasonableness of the defendant’s action. Instead, this legal theory imposes almost automatic liability if certain actions are taken.

To find out the answer in your state, or to see what approaches other states have taken, [click here](https://www.farmprogress.com/crops/water-quality-affects-pesticide-performance) to download the article.

I’d like to thank Hannes for all of his hard work on this article. He certainly did the heavy lifting!

*This material is based upon work supported by the National Agricultural Library, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.*

(Southwest FarmPress, March 11, 2020)

As the warm weather draws more and more Texans outdoors, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service experts want people to be aware of the danger ticks pose.

“Ticks are blood feeders in all life stages and can transmit pathogens that can lead to disease transmission,” said Sonja Swiger, Ph.D., AgriLife Extension entomologist, Stephenville.

“While we do see tick-borne disease here in Texas, our rates are much lower than many other states,” she said. “However, people need to be aware and vigilant. That is the only way to stop them.”
Where ticks are found

Swiger said since ticks can’t fly, the only way to be exposed to them is by entering their space or by catching them from an animal that has picked them up. Unfortunately, ticks can be found pretty much anywhere.

“Aside from if you’re in a concrete jungle, there can be ticks,” Swiger said. “They can be in overgrown brush, a field, forest, park, tall grasses and anywhere there is wildlife.”

Given that many people have been inside more than normal due to COVID-19 and social distancing, Swiger said we do not yet know what that will mean, if anything, when it comes to ticks. Most ticks only live outdoors unless they hitch a ride into a home on a human or animal host.

“Since people haven’t been outdoors as much, that may mean some areas haven’t been mowed in a while or brush hasn’t been cleared. We’ve also seen wildlife coming into some urban areas more during these periods while people have been staying indoors. Will that increase exposure? We just don’t know yet, so people need to take precautions.”

Ticks are something people need to be aware of year-round, although as the weather warms their populations swell, typically peaking in the summer and then declining in the fall. Swiger said we are at the start of their “plentiful season.”

Tick awareness and prevention

As Lyme Disease Awareness Month ends and many people plan to be outdoors for the Memorial Day weekend, now is a good time to review how to protect yourself and your family from these arthropods.

Lyme disease is the most common tick-borne disease, with an average of 30,000 cases a year reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Lyme disease can also affect pets. There are numerous other diseases such as Rocky Mountain spotted fever and tularemia that ticks can transmit to people. Ticks are also responsible for often-deadly diseases in livestock such as cattle fever.

There are 11 common species of ticks found in Texas. The black-legged tick, brown dog tick, Lone Star tick, Gulf Coast tick and American dog tick are the species the average person is most likely to encounter. The TAMU TickApp for Texas and the Southern Region is a helpful tick identification and resource tool.

Ticks typically like to latch on to people’s head, hair, chest, armpit, groin, waist and back of the knees, so be extra vigilant when checking these areas. Headwear and light-colored clothing that protects as much skin as possible is also a good idea if you’ll be outdoors where ticks are present. Pants should be tucked into boots to minimize the odds of bringing an unwanted bloodsucker home.

“Check yourself after being outdoors,” said Swiger. “Also check your pets if they have been outdoors.”

Swiger said people who let their pets sleep in their bed with them need to be extra vigilant.

Around your home, keep lawns mowed, brush trimmed and weeds whacked. Be especially diligent about the areas around swing sets, sand boxes and children’s play areas.

Since rodents are part of the tick-borne disease cycle, eliminate places they like to live and hide. Try to avoid having brush piles and keep any building materials and gardening supplies off the ground.

If a tick is found, it can be removed with tweezers. Grasp the tick as close to the head as possible and pull straight out. If the head breaks off under the skin and cannot be removed, or if any pain, lesion or a rash develops, contact a doctor. If fever, headache, joint pain, muscle pain or swollen lymph nodes occur within 30 days of a tick bite, you should also inform your doctor.
“We don’t want this holiday weekend to be a perfect storm for ticks with the warmer weather, a lot of people outdoors and perhaps more overgrown brush than usual,” Swiger said. “I don’t want people to worry, I just want people to be aware.” (PCT Online, May 28, 2020) https://www.pctonline.com/article/warm-weather-more-ticks/

BIOLOGICALS MARKET STILL EXPERIENCING GROWING PAINS

In many ways, biologicals are seen as the wunderkind of 21st century agriculture: They are viewed as cutting edge, friendlier to the environment than chemical crop protection products and great for both organic and conventional crop producers.

All of the major crop protection companies now have biologicals in their portfolio of products, and there are also many new startup companies in the field. But biologicals are still a new technology and the market is experiencing growing pains.

In a May 14 virtual forum sponsored by the North Carolina Biotechnology Center, executives from four different companies working in the biologicals field addressed the opportunities and challenges facing the biologicals market. Some of their key takeaways included:

• Don’t over-promise and under-deliver on efficacy;

• The organics market is not big enough to focus on to make a profit in biologicals. Companies will need to focus on both the conventional and organic markets;

• For a biological product to be successful, it must be efficacy-based. It must offer a return on a farmer’s investment.

Tom Snipes, chief executive officer of PlantResponse, emphasized there is still some confusion surrounding biologicals in the marketplace. He said it is critical for companies to educate distributors, retailers and farmers on the right fit for biologicals.

“One of the things that is a positive in this whole industry right now is you are starting to see a little bit of a shift in grower sentiment. You’re starting to see a better fit for biologicals, whether it be for bio control or biostimulants.” Snipes said.

“For the most part, people are getting away from the generic claims. They are getting into more of the specific technology,” he added. “While we are going to see biologicals be more successful and this whole class being more successful, it’s probably going to be a little bit more because companies are more sophisticated in their approach and their messaging to the grower. They’re taking more of a higher science approach. I think you’re going to see different attitudes and perceptions.”

Dan Tomsco, chief science officer with AgBiome, agreed with Snipes and said there is still confusion in the marketplace surrounding biologicals.

“When you start to include everything from biocontrol, to biostimulants to general health and yield improvement to inoculants into a single label, confusion is inevitable,” Tomsco said.

“What we’re seeing certainly on the AgBiome side is people falling back to using familiar labels and saying a fungicide is a fungicide or an insecticide is an insecticide and then comma, it’s a biological origin or a chemical origin or some other origin. The grower is thinking about solutions and not so much about the providence of every product that goes on there.”
A big driver in the biologicals market is consumer demand. Natalie Hummel, U.S. development director for ADAMA USA, emphasized that consumers are becoming more engaged in how foods are produced, sometimes from an educated standpoint and sometimes not from such a well-educated standpoint.

“There are perceptions out there on the way foods are grown. Apple packers, for instance, are given additional restrictions, even on top of the current regulatory environment, about what they will allow people to put on the crop in order to actually sell it to them and then distribute it into the food supply chain.

“I see that as one of the drivers in biologicals because there is more interest in additional layers of even just self-imposed regulations and that perspective is being perceived as driven by consumers,” Hummel said.

Snipes said it is critical that companies not over promise and under deliver on efficacy. For a product to be successful, it must be efficacy-based. He said it is rare for a biological product to work in all places and all situations.

“You’re going to get a higher degree of credibility with the grower or with your retail and distribution partners if you can really go in and intelligently talk about your product and what the technology does, but also being honest with yourself in what it does not do,” Snipes emphasized.

Andy Renz, vice-president of business development for Vestaron Corp., emphasized that organics are a key market for biological crop protection tools, but organics are still a small market, representing less than 20 percent of the retail market.

“If you look at the biologicals market itself compared to the synthetics, the organic market is not big. A company that wants to target the organic market will in the end economically fail. What really counts is the safety and sustainability for the environment for the consumer. That’s what really counts on plant health and crop protection products,” Renz said.

(Southwest FarmPress, May 19, 2020)
https://www.farmprogress.com/biotechnology/biologicals-market-still-experiencing-growing-pains

CEU Meetings
None Available

ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links
Online Pest Control Courses
https://www.onlinepestcontrolcourses.com/
PestED.com
https://www.pested.com/
Certified Training Institute
https://www.certifiedtraininginstitute.com/
WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM
https://pep.wsu.edu/rct/recertonline/
CEU University
http://www.ceuschool.org/
Technical Learning College
http://www.abctlc.com/
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/
AG CEU Online
NEW ODAFF Test Information

Testing dates and locations may be limited due to the Covid-19 emergency.

New computerized testing began October 1, 2019. Testing will be done at testing centers in multiple locations around the state by PSI Services LLC.

For more information and instructions please go to http://pested.okstate.edu/html/new-odaff-testing-procedure or the PSI exam information website www.psiexams.com/.

Reservation must be made in advance at www.psiexams.com/ or call (800) 733-9267.

PSI locations.

Oklahoma City I 3800 N Classen Blvd, Ste C-20, Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Oklahoma City II NW 23rd St and Villa Avenue, Suite 60, Shepherd Mall Office Complex, Oklahoma City, OK 73107

Tulsa 2816 East 51St Street, Suite 101, Tulsa, OK 74105

McAlester 21 East Carl Albert Parkway (US Hwy 270), McAlester, Oklahoma 74501

Woodward 1915 Oklahoma Ave, Suite 3, Woodward, OK 73801

Lawton Great Plains Technology Center, 4500 West Lee Blvd Building 300- RM 308, Lawton, OK 73505

Enid Autry Technology Center, 1201 W. Willow Rd, Enid, OK 73703

Ponca City Pioneer Technology Center, 2101 N Ash, Ponca City, OK 74601

If you have questions on pesticide certification. Please email or call:

Kevin Shelton 405-744-1060 kevin.shelton@okstate.edu

Charles Luper 405-744-5808 charles.luper@okstate.edu

Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd

Pesticide Safety Education Program