

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



November, 2015

CHEM

- 1 DEADLINE TO COMMENT ON PESTICIDE CERTIFICATION CHANGES ENDS NOVEMBER 23
- 2 USAG RECYCLING TO COLLECT PESTICIDE CONTAINERS IN NOVEMBER
- 2 EPA PROPOSES TO REVOKE CHLORPYRIFOS FOOD RESIDUE TOLERANCES
- 3 6 HOSPITALIZED AFTER BEE ATTACK IN ARIZONA
- 3 NEW CORN DISEASE CONFIRMED IN ILLINOIS
- 4 US POPCORN MAKER TO PHASE OUT NEONIC
- 5 US EPA CRITICISED OVER PESTICIDE PETITIONS
- 5 AFRICAN ANT FOUND IN A CONNECTICUT STRUCTURE
- 7 US INDUSTRY UPSET WITH NEW FARMWORKER RULES
- 9 CEU MEETINGS
- 10 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 10 ODAFF TEST SESSION INFORMATION

DEADLINE TO COMMENT ON PESTICIDE CERTIFICATION CHANGES ENDS NOVEMBER 23

The deadline to comment on the proposed changes by EPA for pesticide certification ends at the end of the month on November 23rd. Comments can be submitted to EPA at this website

<http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0183>.

Supporting documents can be found at the website above. Some of the potential changes for Oklahoma applicators in the proposal are:

Change certification cycles to 3 years instead of 5.

Private Applicators would be required to take close book exam but would be eligible to recertify by CEUs.

Minimum age of 18 required for certification to use restricted us pesticides.

For more detailed information please go to this EPA website <http://www2.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-updates-standards-increase-safety-and-protect-health-americas-farmworkers> or refer to the supporting documents at the docket website above.

Please contact the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program for any questions you might have at (405) 744-5531. (OSU PSEP)

USAG RECYCLING TO COLLECT PESTICIDE CONTAINERS IN NOVEMBER

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program would like to make Oklahoma Applicators aware of UsAg Recycling plans to collect and chip containers in Oklahoma starting around November 9.

If you have not been contacted by UsAg and would like to get on their pickup schedule in November please call them as soon as possible at 1-800-654-3145. Applicators that are already on their list should have received a courtesy call in the last week or so. (OSU PSEP)

EPA PROPOSES TO REVOKE CHLORPYRIFOS FOOD RESIDUE TOLERANCES

Today, EPA is requesting comment on a proposal to revoke all tolerances for the insecticide chlorpyrifos in response to a court-ordered deadline. At this time, EPA is unable to make a safety finding as required under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) due to exposure to drinking water in certain watersheds.

In June 2015 EPA indicated its intention to issue a proposed rule revoking tolerances by April 15, 2016, to address previously identified drinking water concerns and in response to a petition from the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) and Pesticide Action Network North America (PANNA). This schedule would have allowed time for EPA to complete its additional analysis, taking into consideration the public comments received on its December 2014 human health risk assessment.

On August 10, 2015, the 9th Circuit rejected EPA's time line, instead ordering EPA by October 31, 2015, to either deny the petition, issue a proposed revocation, or issue a final revocation rule. EPA is not denying the petition because we are unable to make a safety finding based on the science as it

stands currently. EPA is not issuing a final revocation rule because we have not proposed it and have not completed our refined drinking water assessment, leaving certain science issues unresolved.

Therefore, as we are informing the court, we have proposed to revoke all chlorpyrifos tolerances based on the science as it stands. Issuing a proposed revocation provides an opportunity for public input prior to any final decision. The court also required EPA to provide the timeline for a final rule should EPA issue a proposed revocation by October 31. EPA is notifying the court of the anticipated release of the final rule in December 2016.

Based on EPA's current analysis, there do not appear to be risks from exposure to chlorpyrifos in food, but, when those exposures are combined with estimated exposure from drinking water in certain watersheds, EPA cannot conclude that the risk from aggregate exposure meets the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) safety standard. EPA has determined that safe levels of chlorpyrifos may be exceeded in parts of the United States for people whose drinking water is derived from some small vulnerable watersheds where chlorpyrifos is heavily used. If the tolerances are revoked, EPA would cancel the associated food uses of chlorpyrifos.

Within the next few months, the public will have an opportunity to comment on both a completed hazard assessment and the completed drinking water analysis prior to EPA issuing a final rule. EPA is currently performing additional analysis related to its hazard assessment in order to make certain that any final decision protects infants and children. Once completed, if warranted, it would inform a final tolerance revocation rule.

EPA is also continuing to work on its refined drinking water analysis for the entire country. In December 2014, EPA released a human health risk assessment for chlorpyrifos. The assessment indicated the potential for drinking water risks in small watersheds characterized by high concentrations of farming where chlorpyrifos may be widely used. The 2014 assessment included a refined drinking water analysis for the Pacific

Northwest and the Southeast, but not the entire country.

EPA is releasing this proposed rule at this time in order to comply with the October 31, 2015, deadline ordered by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in response to a petition from NRDC and PANNA. NRDC and PANNA petitioned EPA to revoke all chlorpyrifos food residue tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and cancel all registrations of products containing chlorpyrifos under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

Additional information including the pre-publication version of the proposed rule is found at: <http://www2.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/proposal-revoke-chlorpyrifos-food-residue-tolerances>.

EPA will accept comments on this proposed rule for 60 days. The Proposed Tolerance Revocation Rule will be available at www.regulations.gov in docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653.

(EPA, October 30, 2015)
<http://www2.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-proposes-revoke-chlorpyrifos-food-residue-tolerances>

6 HOSPITALIZED AFTER BEE ATTACK IN ARIZONA

Six people were sent to the hospital Saturday afternoon after a swarm of bees attacked residents in a subdivision, the Maricopa, Arizona, fire department said.

The bees hit the Rancho El Dorado subdivision about 5 p.m. and attacked people in a two-block-long area, the department said in a news release. People ran and screamed for help.

Three adults and three children were taken to a nearby hospital for treatment of the stings, the department said. One of the adults had nearly 300

bee stings counted at the hospital. Two firefighters who were also stung during the rescue did not need treatment at the hospital, the department said. It took fire crews about two hours to find the hive in an opened water valve box at one of the homes, the department said. The bees were sprayed with foam, and the hive was contained and killed.

A particularly aggressive strain of honeybee menaced parts of Arizona during the summer, with some people getting stung so many times that they were hospitalized.

Experts say the state is dealing with the Africanized honeybee, also known as the killer bee, which is a crossbreed between the European honeybee and the African honeybee.

The killer bee is the result of experiments in Brazil decades ago, and the insects migrated to the U.S. The bees are more prevalent in warm Southwestern states such as Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. If their hives are disrupted, they become especially aggressive. (FoxNews, November 1, 2015)
<http://www.foxnews.com/us/2015/11/01/6-hospitalized-after-bee-attack-in-arizona/>

NEW CORN DISEASE CONFIRMED IN ILLINOIS

Symptomatic corn leaf samples from Champaign County, IL, have been confirmed positive for the bacterium *Burkholderia andropogonis* (*Pseudomonas adropogonis* (Smith) Stapp.), the causal agent of Bacterial Stripe disease by the University of Illinois Plant Clinic, reports Suzanne Bissonnette for University of Illinois Extension

This has been reported to the Illinois Department of Agriculture and the USDA. The pathogen was identified by symptomology, bacterial colony characteristics and 16S DNA sequencing.

Bacterial stripe foliar symptoms unfortunately are similar to other endemic bacterial leaf pathogens of

corn, such as Goss's Wilt and Stewart's Wilt. Lesions appear initially as lime-green to yellow

diffuse discoloration running parallel with leaf veins. As the lesion matures brown necrotic streaking is evident in the center of the lesion, lesions may be 2-5 inches or more in length.

This is a new disease to corn in Illinois. There is little current or historical information available on impact to corn yields by this pathogen in the U.S. The bacterium is widely prevalent and infects a large number of plants including, Johnson grass, sorghum, rye and clover to name a few. It is reported that the disease becomes more severe during period of wet humid weather. Vidaver and Carlson of the University of Nebraska reported in 1978, that the disease was observed in 1973-1975 in South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Michigan. Conclusions were that the disease caused no economic impact at the time.

Be on the outlook for this disease in corn next season. Be aware that symptoms of this disease may be confused with other bacterial leaf blights so lab testing may be necessary to differentiate. (CropLife, October 7, 2015) <http://www.croplife.com/crop-inputs/fungicides/new-corn-disease-confirmed-in-illinois/>

US POPCORN MAKER TO PHASE OUT NEONIC USE

US microwave popcorn maker Pop Weaver intends to phase out the use of seeds sourced from maize treated with neonicotinoid insecticides, bowing to pressure from environmentalists who contend that they are a major factor in the declines of bees and other pollinators.

The company aims to remove 50% of its neonicotinoid usage by 2016 and 75% by 2017, with a "long-term commitment of further reducing usage by working with agricultural universities and those companies supplying neonicotinoids to the seed industry".

Pop Weaver, which generates an estimated \$58 million in annual revenues, notes that the pesticides are not applied to the kernels it sells to consumers. "There is no human health risk," the company says, adding that it made the decision to phase out neonicotinoid use "because we've always believed in doing what's right, and we remain conscious of the environment around us".

The move came less than a week after the Center for Food Safety (CFS) launched an advertising campaign targeting Pop Weaver and fellow popcorn maker Pop Secret to abandon their reliance on maize grown from seeds that have been pre-treated with neonicotinoids. The campaign highlighted the potential harm to bees from the insecticides and argued that the two popcorn makers could make a "real impact" by phasing out their use of neonicotinoid-treated seeds.

More than 90% of all US field maize likely comes from seeds treated with a neonicotinoid insecticide.

The CFS hails Pop Weaver's decision. "With a large share of the market, Pop Weaver has the ability to not only become leaders in pollinator protection but to also influence their competitors in the popcorn seed market to do the same," says Larissa Walker, CFS pollinator program director. "This is a very important market shift." (Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, October 26, 2015)

US EPA CRITICISED OVER PESTICIDE PETITIONS

The US EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) lacks effective policies and procedures needed to transparently and efficiently handle public petitions, according to the Agency's Office of Inspector General (OIG).

The OIG's 20-page report offers a scathing assessment of the OPP, broadly criticising its failure to adequately track and respond to public petitions. "Due to the lack of transparency and direct communication, some petitioners sued the EPA for 'unreasonable delay', resulting in unnecessary costs to the Agency and public," the OIG says.

The OIG reviewed some 40 public petitions submitted to the OPP since 2005, including requests to revoke tolerances as well as others that called for the cancellation or suspension of specific pesticides. The report analysed the effectiveness of how the OPP tracks public pesticide petitions, evaluating whether it has processes to ensure transparency and consistency when responding to public pesticide petitions.

It found the OPP's efforts sorely lacking. The Office did not "effectively communicate" with petitioners, often failing to acknowledge receipt of petitions, according to the OIG report. The OPP also did not consistently or openly share updates about efforts to resolve petitions or to provide decisions. The report says that petition documentation was "not readily accessible" and notes that there is "no guidance" on how to submit petitions directly to the OPP.

The OIG recommends that the OPP develop new policies and procedures to improve how it manages petitions and communicates with petitioners, including new training for staff and the implementation of a new tracking system, as well as guidance to the public. The OPP says that it agrees with the recommendations and intends to take steps to remedy the OIG's concerns.

The report comes as the OPP is embroiled in legal controversy over its failure to formally respond to a petition filed by environmentalist groups urging the

revocation of tolerances for chlorpyrifos. The petition, filed with the Agency in 2007 by the Natural Resources Defense Council and Pesticide Action Network North America, argues that the insecticide poses serious developmental risks to children and calls for all agricultural uses to be banned.

The EPA's failure to respond sparked an eight-year legal fight that culminated this summer in a court ruling ordering the Agency to act by this Friday (October 31st). The US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit called the EPA's delay "egregious", concluding that an order requiring a response was needed "to end a cycle of incomplete responses, missed deadlines, and unreasonable delay". (Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, October 29, 2015)

AFRICAN ANT FOUND IN A CONNECTICUT STRUCTURE

Editor's note: On Oct. 16, the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station confirmed that ants found throughout a structure in Cromwell, Conn., were the invasive African ant, *Pheidole megacephala*. Rose Hiskes from the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station reported these findings and developed the following fact sheet about this invasive ant.

On October 16, 2015 a pest control operator brought some very small ants to the information office of the Valley Laboratory, CAES in Windsor, Conn. The samples were from a large structure in Cromwell, Conn., and were found throughout the structure. The ants had been a low level problem for some years, but had recently become a large problem. Any food crumb dropped was quickly covered by these ants. The pest control operator reported that no winged forms had been found in the building. Initial research showed this ant was not a common species. Jane O'Donnell, of the University Connecticut and Stefan Cover, of

Harvard University, were consulted and a diagnosis of *Pheidole megacephala* was arrived at.

Native to the Afrotropics, this is an aggressive ant that is now distributed in many locations worldwide. According to AntWeb, it has been found in Southern California, Missouri, Florida and Baltimore, Maryland in the United States. This is the farthest north this ant has been reported to date.

DESCRIPTION: Commonly called the bigheaded ant (BHA), *Pheidole megacephala* has two worker castes: larger sized individuals called the major caste and smaller individuals called the minor caste. The head of this ant species is disproportionately larger than the body in the major caste and less so in the minor cast.

A few major and many minor workers were brought to the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station with the major workers 3 mm in length and the minor workers 2 mm in length. The head is a darker red brown than the body and the gaster is darker brown on both castes. There are long, upright, yellow hairs sparsely scattered over most of the body. The oval-shaped head, of the minor worker, and larger heart-shaped head of the major worker have antennae that are twelve segmented with a 3-segmented club. The antennal scape is longer than the head in the minors we received and shorter than the head in the major workers. The sculpturing on the face is different in the two castes. There are small wrinkles on the lower face on either side of where the antennae are inserted in the minor worker, but on the major workers there is more sculpturing across the entire lower face. Mandibles contain 5 – 7 teeth.

The thorax has a ‘broken back’ look and is pitted on the last two segments. When viewed in profile, the middle segment is lower than the first and the last segment drops down even further and has two short spines on either side.

The abdomen has two pedicels. The first is elongated with a stalk attaching to the thorax. This

segment is also pitted. The post petiole is rounded when viewed from above and has a smooth surface with a few hairs.

BIOLOGY: *Pheidole megacephala* is an omnivorous ant, preying on other insects as well as feeding on any human or animal food of plant or animal origin. In Hawaii, BHA tends mealybugs on papaya to harvest their honeydew. They do not sting unless the nest is disturbed and the sting is not painful.

This ant usually nests in the soil. In Florida it constructs foraging tubes of plant debris to move around above ground. Where large nests are found near buildings, workers frequently forage in buildings for food. Trails of workers can be seen moving long distances between food sources and the nest.

In buildings BHA can nest in wall voids, suspended ceilings and other spaces. They do no structural damage. It remains to be seen if they can nest in large potted plants.

Outdoor colonies can get very large and displace native ant species with their aggressive behavior. It is not known if they can overwinter outdoors in New England.

This ant may be moving around the globe in soils associated with potted houseplants or agricultural products (Stefan Cover, personal communication). The structure in which they were found in Connecticut has many large palm and other houseplants. Many houseplants are produced in the tropics where this ant is present in large numbers.

MANAGEMENT: In buildings, removing food sources should help reduce ant populations. Since BHA will eat spilled food crumbs, keeping kitchens and eating areas clean and vacuumed is necessary. Be sure food waste garbage cans are sealed tightly. Keeping the building as free as possible of other insects will reduce food available to these ants. Also controlling living insects on house plants such as

aphids, mealybugs or scales, which secrete honeydew, is needed as well.

Trials in pineapple fields in Hawaii showed Amdro in bait stations managed BHA populations well (Taniguchi, Thompson and Sipes, 2006).

Field trials in Florida concluded that 28 days post treatment, MaxForce Fire Ant Bait with fipronil, provided the best suppression of BHA (Warner, Yang and Scheffrahn, 2008).

In Connecticut BHA has only been reported to date as being in a building. If true, this limits the reinfestation of ants from outside the treatment area. Both Amdro and MaxForce are labelled for use in buildings in Connecticut. More research is needed to find the pathway by which BHA arrived here and to see if we can get eradication using newer, possibly more effective, products.

Voucher specimens of *Pheidole megacephala* were deposited in the following collections: The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven; The University of Connecticut, Entomology Collection; and the California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco. (PCT Online, November 2, 2015) <http://www.pctonline.com/article/african-ant-connecticut>

US INDUSTRY UPSET WITH NEW FARMWORKER RULES

The US EPA's farmworker protection rules have drawn swift praise from environmentalist groups and farmworker advocates as well-crafted and long overdue. But agricultural interests and the pesticide industry say that the new restrictions are unwarranted and costly. The existing rules, known collectively as the Worker Protection Standard (WPS), were "working, and under it safety trends were headed in the right direction", says Daren Coppock, president and CEO of the Agricultural Retailers Association (ARA). "This new WPS was not necessary."

The EPA issued the final revisions to the WPS last week, requiring workers to receive additional pesticide safety training and setting new restrictions on when workers can access treated fields. The new rules require the use of protective equipment and impose new record-keeping demands on employers. In addition, the revamp of the WPS requires that individuals who handle pesticides be at least 18 years old unless the adolescent is working on a farm owned by an immediate family member. Other changes finalized by the EPA aim to bring hazard communication requirements more into line with other federal agencies, notably respirator use rules developed by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

But the ARA, the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), CropLife America (CLA) and an array of grower groups all criticise the EPA's proposed changes to the WPS, questioning whether the Agency has a good grasp on the scope of the alleged problem. "We are concerned that the Agency is piling regulatory costs on farmers and ranchers that bear little if any relation to actual safety issues," says Paul Schlegel, director of environment and energy policy for the AFBF.

The EPA justified the changes based on "unfounded assumptions and deliberately misleading cost analysis", according to Mr Coppock. He suggests that the EPA had ignored evidence that farmworker safety had improved significantly since 1992, when the WPS was implemented, and disregarded industry requests to provide data supporting its assumption of elevated levels of chronic illnesses among farmworkers. The Agency has shown a "deliberate disregard of the real-world implications of the rule", Mr Coppock says. "The EPA assumed problems existed, invented a solution, and speculated the solution will have positive effects."

CLA is similarly unimpressed and says that the EPA appears to be trying to appease farmworker advocates and environmentalist groups. The pesticide industry trade group notes that the president of the United Farm Workers (UFW), an outspoken advocate in favour of the new rules, joined officials from the EPA and the OSHA on a press event announcing the final revisions to the WPS.

A top official with UFW calls the new WPS "a long time coming" and says that the end result would be better protection for farm workers. "We can [now] say that most of the same rules that have protected other American workers from dangerous cancer- and birth-defect causing pesticides are finally going to protect farm workers under the new EPA regulations," says Giev Kashkooli, vice-president for advocacy group United Farm Workers (UFW). "We are honored to have worked with a great coalition to help make it happen."

CLA president and CEO Jay Vroom criticizes the EPA's "rhetoric" and says that the inclusion of UFW at the official announcement put "a disappointing political spin" on the event. Mr Vroom adds that the rule is "enormous, more than 300 pages" and suggests that it will take time for stakeholders to fully grasp its implications.

The final rule "may well contain some improvements and additional problems beyond the scope of the original proposal", he concludes. "We will respond in greater detail about the specifics of the new rule once our teams have thoroughly evaluated the entirety of the rule revisions (Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, October 7, 2015)

CEU Meetings

Date: November 10-12, 2015

Title: Oklahoma AG Expo
Location: Embassy Suites Norman OK
Contact: Tammy Ford Miller (580) 233-9516

Course #: OK-15-098

CEU's:	Category(s):
6	1A
1	4
1	7C
8	10

Date: November 10, 2015

Title: Red River Specialty Rights of Way and
Bareground Work Shop
Location: Courtyard by Marriott Norman OK
Contact: Phillip Lawrence (580) 436-0883

Course #: OK-15-123

CEU's:	Category(s):
6	1A
1	4
1	7C
8	10

Date: November 19-20, 2015

Title: Winfield Emerald Regional Conference
Location: Yukon OK
Contact: Dennis Christie (405) 203-1751

Course #: OK-15-113

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

Date: January 20-21, 2016

Title: Red River Crops Conference
Location: Southwest Technology Center Altus, OK
Contact: Gary Strickland (580) 482-0823
Course #: OK-15-089

CEU's:	Category(s):
4	1A
4	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 November/December 2015 are as follows:

November		December	
2	McAlester	1	Goodwell
3	Goodwell	3	Tulsa
5	Tulsa	4	OKC
6	OKC	7	Atoka
10	Hobart	9	Lawton
13	OKC	11	OKC
19	Tulsa	14	McAlester
20	OKC	17	Tulsa
		17	Enid
		18	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

<h1>Pesticide Safety Education Program</h1>
