CHEM

November, 2014

1 UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL DATE SET

2 LAST TEST HELP SESSION FOR 2014

2 EPA PROPOSES TO REMOVE 72 CHEMICALS FROM APPROVED PESTICIDE INERT INGREDIENT LIST

3 EPA FINDS NEONICOTINOID SEED TREATMENTS OF LITTLE OR NO BENEFIT TO U.S. SOYBEAN PRODUCTION

4 CLASS ACTION SUIT FILED AGAINST CITY OVER BED BUG INFESTATION

4 US EPA APPROVES DOW ENLIST DUO HERBICIDE

6 LAWSUIT FILED AGAINST ENLIST DUO APPROVAL

7 EXTREME SPIDER INFESTATION FORCES MISSOURI FAMILY TO RELOCATE

7 US EPA SEEKS TO CURB PESTICIDE DRIFT

8 CEU Meetings

9 Online CEU Links

10 ODAFF Test Session Information

UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL DATE SET

The next date for the Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program has been set for April 22, 2015. The collection will be held in Purcell at the McClain County Fairgrounds. The collection will be run from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. For more information please go to the website at http://pested.okstate.edu/html/unwanted.html

2014 RECERTIFICATION TESTS AVAILABLE

Certifications for applicators in categories 3A, 3B, 3C, 7A, and 6 expire December 31, 2014. Applicators must have accumulated the correct amount of CEUs by December 31, 2014 or retake the category exam to keep their certification current into the next cycle which will end in 2019.

The 2014 recertification tests for categories 3A, 3B, 3C, 7A, and 6 are now available at ODAFF test sessions for applicators wishing to retest.

Applicators should receive a letter from ODAFF on their current status of CEUs needed or if they must retest. Applicators can also check CEU status on our webpage at http://pested.okstate.edu.
LAST TEST HELP SESSION FOR 2014

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will conduct the last test help sessions for 2014. The workshop will be held December 16th at the Oklahoma County Extension Center 930 N Portland in Oklahoma City.

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. Testing will begin at 1:30 pm.

NO CEU’s will be given for this program!

Test Help Workshop dates for 2015 are being set and will be posted soon. When finalized, the dates will be posted at the website below.
http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm

EPA PROPOSES TO REMOVE 72 CHEMICALS FROM APPROVED PESTICIDE INERT INGREDIENT LIST

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is requesting public comment on a proposal to remove 72 chemicals from its list of substances approved for use as inert ingredients in pesticide products.

“We are taking action to ensure that these ingredients are not added to any pesticide products unless they have been fully vetted by EPA,” said Jim Jones, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. “This is the first major step in our strategy to reduce risks from pesticides containing potentially hazardous inert ingredients.”

EPA is taking this action in response to petitions by the Center for Environmental Health, Beyond Pesticides, Physicians for Social Responsibility and others. These groups asked the agency to issue a rule requiring disclosure of 371 inert ingredients found in pesticide products. EPA developed an alternative strategy designed to reduce the risks posed by hazardous inert ingredients in pesticide products more effectively than by disclosure rulemaking. EPA outlined its strategy in a May 22, 2014 letter:

Many of the 72 inert ingredients targeted for removal, are on the list of 371 inert ingredients identified by the petitioners as hazardous. The 72 chemicals are not currently being used as inert ingredients in any pesticide product. Chemicals such as, turpentine oil and nitrous oxide are listed as candidates for removal.

Most pesticide products contain a mixture of different ingredients. Ingredients that are directly responsible for controlling pests such as insects or weeds are called active ingredients. An inert ingredient is any substance that is intentionally included in a pesticide that is not an active
ingredient.

For the list of 72 chemical substances and to receive information on how to provide comments, see the Federal Register Notice in docket # EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0558. To access this notice, copy and paste the docket number into the search box at: http://regulations.gov. Comments are due November 21, 2014.

General information on inert ingredients can be found at: http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/inert-ingredients-overview-and-guidance. (EPA October 23, 2014) http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/bd4379a92ceceec8525735900400c27/3397554fa65588d685257d7a0061a300!OpenDocument

EPA FINDS NEONICOTINOID SEED TREATMENTS OF LITTLE OR NO BENEFIT TO U.S. SOYBEAN PRODUCTION

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released an analysis of the benefits of neonicotinoid seed treatments for insect control in soybeans. Neonicotinoid pesticides are a class of insecticides widely used on U.S. crops that EPA is reviewing with particular emphasis for their impact on pollinators. The analysis concluded that there is little or no increase in soybean yields using most neonicotinoid seed treatments when compared to using no pest control at all. A Federal Register notice inviting the public to comment on the analysis will publish in the near future.

“We have made the review of neonicotinoid pesticides a high priority,” said Jim Jones, assistant administrator for EPA’s Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. “In our analysis of the economic benefits of this use we concluded that, on a national scale, U.S. soybean farmers see little or no benefit from neonicotinoid seed treatments.”

During the review of the neonicotinoids, EPA found that many scientific publications claim that treating soybean seeds has little value. Part of our assessment examined the effectiveness of these seed treatments for pest control and estimated the impacts on crop yields and quality, as well as financial losses and gains. The law requires EPA to consider the benefits of using pesticides as well as the risks.

The analysis concluded that:

- There is no increase in soybean yield using most neonicotinoid seed treatments when compared to using no pest control at all.
- Alternative insecticides applied as sprays are available and effective.
- All major alternatives are comparable in cost.
- Neonicotinoid seed treatment could provide an insurance benefit against sporadic and unpredictable insect pests, but this potential benefit is not likely to be large or widespread throughout the United States.

This analysis is an important part of the science EPA will use to move forward with the assessment of the risks and benefits under registration review for the neonicotinoid pesticides. Registration review --- the periodic re-evaluation of pesticides to determine if they continue to meet the safety standard --- can result in EPA discontinuing certain uses, placing limits on the pesticide registration, and requiring other label changes.

Sign up for pesticide program updates to be notified by email when the EPA opens the docket and invites comment on its analysis of the benefits of neonicotinoid seed treatments on soybeans. (EPA October 16, 2014) http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/bd4379a92eceec8525735900400c27/aa78c4812c2c7a5785257d7300721da0!OpenDocument
CLASS ACTION SUIT FILED AGAINST CITY OVER BED BUG INFESTATION

People who live in a city owned apartment complex say the place is infested with bed bugs and that Des Moines city leaders aren’t doing enough to solve the problem.

So the residents are getting the courts involved.

More than fifty tenants at the Royal View Manor apartment complex, a 200-unit facility for low income families have joined a class action lawsuit trying to force the city to clean it up and pay for damages.

At Royal View Manor, residents say they don’t have much and what they do have, they’re being forced to throw away.

“I lost my love seat, I lost my bed,” said Julie Davis, a resident.

Most of the stuff is stacked up near the dumpster. All of it is infested with bed bugs.

“It’s getting to the point I want to move out here and find somewhere else to go,” said Lewis.

Dozens claim to be victims of the annoying, at times painful pests. Few have as many scars as Orna Tigner and her neighbor Jeanette McDowell.

“It’s just so devastating, it’s humiliating. You’re embarrassed,” said McDowell.

Both admit the city has hired pest control companies to heat treat and spray their apartments on a regular basis but as soon as the exterminators leave, they say the bugs show right back up.

“I want my stuff replaced that I’ve had to throw out because of the bed bugs and I want to be compensated so I can move to a place that is safe,” Tigner told Channel 13 News.

Steve Wandro is one of two attorneys working on the class action lawsuit.

He has recently filed two lawsuits on bed bug infestations at privately owned low income complexes. Both settled for about $2.5 million dollars split between the residents.

“It’s our hope the management and the city will start addressing the problem now. There’s no reason these problems have to be present,” said Wandro.

However, these lawsuits can take years. McDowell and the others say they can’t take another minute.

“There were times I wouldn’t even shower. I just wanted to get out of this apartment,” McDowell told Channel 13 News.

Doug Romig, the housing director for the City of Des Moines says units are inspected for bed bugs four times each year and are heat treated if a problem is found.

He also says educational sessions about containing bed bugs are held for residents.

Romig adds the city has applied for a grant from HUD that would allow for a $2.5 million renovation of the property.

US EPA APPROVES DOW ENLIST DUO HERBICIDE

The US EPA has cleared the way for Dow AgroSciences to commercialize its Enlist crops comprising genetically modified herbicide-tolerant DAS40278 maize and DAS68416 and DAS44406 soybeans. The Agency formally registered the company’s herbicide, Enlist Duo (2,4-D choline + glyphosate), that is intended for use on the GM traits.
Last month the USDA approved the GM crops, concluding that the new traits do not pose a risk to other plants. DAS40278 maize is tolerant to 2,4-D and aryloxyphenoxy propionate graminicides such as quizalofop. DAS68416 soybeans are tolerant to several auxin herbicides including 2,4-D, 2,4-DB, MCPA, triclopyr and fluroxypyr, and glufosinate-ammonium. DAS44406 soybeans are tolerant to the same herbicides plus glyphosate. The latter were developed in conjunction with M S Technologies and will be commercialized under the Enlist E3 brand.

The EPA's decision is a major win for Dow, which estimates that the market for its Enlist cropping system could reach $1,000 million. “Crossing this final milestone represents a pivotal achievement for Dow, as it enables the company to bring to the market this necessary, innovative technology that is expected to deliver significant growth for Dow while at the same time addressing a critical global challenge,” said Dow’s chairman and CEO Andrew Liveris.

The company, along with major US farm groups, says that the new crops are needed to help combat growing weed resistances to glyphosate and other widely-used herbicides.

The EPA's top pesticides official echoed that view. Enlist Duo will provide a new tool to help farmers "manage troublesome weeds" while growing GM maize and soybeans, said Jim Jones, assistant administrator of the EPA's Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP). "Our decision reflects sound science and an understanding of the risks of pesticides to human health and the environment."

The EPA touted its decision to impose "first-time ever restrictions" to manage the problem of resistant weeds. The Agency is requiring Dow to monitor and report to it any evidence that weeds are becoming resistant to the new herbicide.

The EPA noted that Dow's new formulation is less prone to drift and volatilization than other 2,4-D products, but said that to address potential drift concerns, it has imposed a 30-foot (9.1 m) in-field "no spray" buffer zone around application areas. Only ground applications are permitted and applications of the herbicide are prohibited when wind speeds are in excess of 15 mph (24.1 kph).

The EPA is also limiting the registration to six years, rather than the usual 15 years, so that it can review the issue of resistance. The herbicide is currently permitted for use in only six states (Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin). But the EPA is taking comments on extending registration to an additional ten states (Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Tennessee and North Dakota).

Legal hurdle

Dow intends to offer the new herbicide and GM crops to US farmers next year, but the company may face a hurdle. US environmental groups have long promised to file suit to block commercialization and swiftly reiterated that position on Wednesday.

The Center for Food Safety’s (CFS) Executive Director Andrew Kimbrell said his group "will pursue all available legal options to stop the commercialization of these dangerous crops". Approval of the Enlist herbicide and crops was a heavy blow for the CFS and other critics, who waged extensive campaigns against the Dow products and rallied more than 500,000 individuals to voice opposition to the EPA and the USDA.

The CFS and other critics argue the new herbicide and GM crops will cause environmental and economic harms and do little to address weed resistance. They also cite concerns about the possible health impacts from 2,4-D, including possible links to cancer, reproductive toxicity and endocrine disruption.
Agency defence

The EPA, in a rare move, sought to immediately assuage critics of its decision, holding a two-hour technical briefing with the public hosted by staff and risk assessors from the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) responsible for giving Enlist Duo the greenlight.

"2,4-D has been registered for more than 60 years for an array of uses," said Dan Kenny, chief of the OPP's Herbicide Branch. "This is one of the most widely studied and understood pesticides on the market." 2,4-D is one of the most widely used herbicides in the world, Mr Kenny said, and 2,4-D products have been registered in dozens of countries along with the US, including Canada, Mexico, Japan and 26 EU member states.

Agency scientists said that they used "highly conservative and protective assumptions" to evaluate human health and ecological risks, ensuring that the approved uses are protective of the public, farmworkers and the environment.

With regard to human exposure, the Agency is "regulating at a level that is 100-fold lower than the dose level where no observed effects occurred", said Elizabeth Mendez, a senior scientist with OPP’s Health Effects Division. The EPA has determined that the registered uses of the new herbicide are "safe for humans and the environment when used in accordance with the label", Mr Kenny added.

OCSPP chief Mr Jones also took direct issue with the claim by critics that the 2,4-D herbicide is a derivative of the controversial defoliant Agent Orange, used by the US military during the Vietnam War. Although 2,4-D was a key ingredient in the defoliant, it was another pesticide, 2,4,5-T, and its contaminant that caused the health issues associated with Agent Orange, Mr Jones said. The EPA banned 2,4,5-T in 1985, Mr Jones said, adding that to critics who equate 2,4-D to Agent Orange are furthering "an urban myth."

(Lawsuit filed against Enlist Duo approval

Environmentalist group Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) has filed suit to block the US EPA's approval of Dow's herbicide, Enlist Duo (2,4-D choline + glyphosate). The group filed the challenge with the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit immediately after the EPA announced its decision to register the herbicide, a mixture of glyphosate and 2,4-D choline. The NRDC argues that the herbicide will destroy monarch butterfly populations and poses undue risks to human health.

The pesticide is intended for use on Dow's Enlist crops comprising genetically modified herbicide-tolerant DAS40278 maize and DAS68416 and DAS44406 soybeans. The EPA's registration allows the new pesticide to be used in six Midwestern states. Dow hopes to offer the Enlist crops and herbicide to US farmers next year.

But the NRDC is keen to derail commercialization and says that the Agency has failed to consider how Enlist Duo might impact monarch butterflies. The group filed a petition in March with the EPA calling for stricter rules on glyphosate use to protect the monarch.

The new lawsuit also takes aim at the approval of the 2,4-D component of the Enlist Duo herbicide. The NRDC contends that the agency has failed to fully consider the potential human health impacts from 2,4-D, suggesting it has ignored evidence of potential links to decreased fertility, birth defects and thyroid problems.

This could well be the first of several legal challenges. The Center for Food Safety, the Pesticide Action Network, the Environmental Working Group and the environmental law firm Earthjustice have all signaled their intent to explore
all legal options to reverse approval of the Dow crops and pesticide.

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

EXTREME SPIDER INFESTATION FORCES MISSOURI FAMILY TO RELOCATE

A home with prime views of the third and fourth holes at Whitmoor Country Club has been vacant for two years because of a creepy crawly problem, the St. Louis Dispatch reported.

The home was infested with between 4,500 and 6,000 brown recluse spiders, according to one estimate.

The previous homeowners abandoned the 2,400-square-foot atrium ranch after years of pesticide treatments couldn’t curb the invasion.

The home went into foreclosure and hasn’t sold, apparently because no one wanted to live with its history.

Workers from McCarthy Pest Control fumigated the house on Oct. 5, the article noted.

(PCT Online, October 15, 2014)

US EPA SEEKS TO CURB PESTICIDE DRIFT

The US EPA has launched a new program to rate technologies that can reduce pesticide drift, a move the Agency hopes will encourage the development and use of safer spray technology and equipment.

The voluntary Drift Reduction Technology (DRT) program calls on manufacturers to submit data to the EPA verifying the effectiveness of their technologies, such as nozzles, spray shields and drift reduction chemicals. The Agency will then evaluate each data submission and assign one to four stars to products that can reduce drift by at least 25%. The EPA is also asking pesticide manufacturers to label their products for use with DRT technologies.

"Every year, state and local agencies receive thousands of complaints about the impacts of pesticide drift on people, wildlife and plants," says Jim Jones, assistant administrator for the EPA's Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. "Our new star-rating system of products and technologies will help farmers reduce drift, protect neighbors and reduce costs by keeping more of the pesticide on the crop."

The EPA hopes to have the DRT ratings on pesticide labels by the autumn of 2015.

The industry association, CropLife America (CLA), has praised the new program and says that it is a good means of recognizing the benefits from new spray application technologies. The DRT program is "an important milestone for EPA, and we hope that it will continue to evolve and improve as the program matures," Mike Leggett, the CLA's senior director of environmental policy, told Agrow.

Environmental groups, however, are likely to be wary of the voluntary nature of the program, which is the latest effort by the EPA to get a better handle on how to tackle the vexing issue of pesticide drift. The Agency says that some 10% of agricultural pesticide sprays drift from the intended target crop.
Some 70 million lbs (31,750 tonnes) of pesticides valued up to $640 million are lost to pesticide drift each year.

The EPA has been wrestling with the issue of DRT for more than a decade, but its efforts have stalled largely due to concerns about testing protocols and costs to manufacturers.

Other efforts to tackle drift have also proven contentious. The Agency released a plan earlier this year to change how it assesses the environmental and human health risks of pesticide spray drift, suggesting that the revised framework would provide more realistic risk estimates and strengthen protections for people and the environment from drift.

But industry has broadly criticized the effort, arguing that the changes will lead the Agency to overstate exposure and risks from drift and potentially lead to unwarranted restrictions on pesticide usage. The EPA is still reviewing public comments on the plan.

Environmental groups and farmworker advocates continue to press the Agency to impose more stringent safety standards to improve drift protections for children and farmworkers.

In March, the Agency denied a petition filed by Pesticide Action Network and other environmental groups that asked for tighter drift regulations. The EPA said that its current approach for addressing and regulating pesticide drift is working and does not warrant revisions. The groups filed suit in June challenging the decision, calling on the US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals to compel the EPA to impose spray buffers and improve protections for children from pesticide drift.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, October 23, 2014)
Date: November 20, 2014  
Title: Prairie Dog Stewardship  
Location: Pontotoc County Extension Office Ada OK  
Contact: Jen Moon 866-442-3467  
Course #: OK-14-141  
www.kaputproducts.com

CEU's: Category(s):  
1  1A  
1  6  
1  11a  
1  10

Date: November 21, 2014  
Title: Ornamental and Turf Winter Workshop  
Location: OSU- OKC Campus Oklahoma City OK  
Contact: Julia Laughlin (405)-945-3348  
Course #: OK-14-132  
www.kaputproducts.com

CEU's: Category(s):  
1  1A  
1  6  
1  11a  
1  10

Date: December 9, 2014  
Title: Pesticide Safety & Stored Product Pest Control Recertification  
Location: Salina KS  
Contact: Ted Graham (855) 377-3444  
Course #: OK-14-142  
www.foodprotectionservices.net

CEU's: Category(s):  
6  7A  
5  7C

Date: December 15, 2014  
Title: Texas Vegetative Management Association  
Location: Lubbock TX  
Contact: Kay Dippel (979) 968-5612  
Course #: OK-14-140  
www.tvma.net

CEU's: Category(s):  
1  5  
4  6

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 November/December 2014 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>McAlester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goodwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>OKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>McAlester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goodwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Atoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lawton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>OKC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

ATOKA KIAMICHI TECH CENTER 1301
W Liberty Rd, Seminar Center

Ardmore Carter County Extension Center

Pesticide Safety Education Program