

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



December, 2016

CHEM

- 1 DECEMBER TEST HELP SESSIONS
- 2 EPA EXTENDS COMMENT PERIOD FOR MALATHION ASSESSMENT
- 2 EPA REGISTERS DICAMBA FORMULATION FOR USE ON DICAMBA TOLERANT CROPS
- 3 DRAFT RISK ASSESSMENTS NOW OPEN FOR COMMENT
- 3 EPA ADDRESSES USE OF DRY ICE TO CONTROL RODENTS
- 4 LAWSUIT CHALLENGES MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MD.) LAWN CARE BAN
- 4 US LAWMAKERS BLAST EPA ATRAZINE REVIEW
- 5 ZIKA SURFACES IN TEXAS
- 6 DOW AGROSCIENCES, U.S. FARMERS DISAGREE WITH EPA PROPOSAL TO REVOKE CHLORPYRIFOS TOLERANCES
- 7 MAJOR REVIEW FINDS NEONIC POSES LOW RISK TO AQUATIC INVERTEBRATES
- 7 MONSANTO: NEWS STORY QUESTIONING GMO BENEFITS USED 'CHERRY-PICKED' DATA
- 9 CEU MEETINGS
- 9 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 10 ODAFF TEST SESSION INFORMATION

DECEMBER TEST HELP SESSIONS

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will conduct the last test help sessions for 2016 in December. The workshops will be held December 7th in OKC and December 8th in Tulsa.

The Tulsa session will be at the Tulsa County Extension Office at 4116 E. 15th. **The Oklahoma City Test help session will be in a new location at the Oklahoma County Extension Office 2500 NE 63rd.**

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 8:30 and the program will run from 8:45 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 2017. Please go to the website below for the 2017 dates.

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

EPA EXTENDS COMMENT PERIOD FOR MALATHION ASSESSMENT

EPA is extending the public comment period for the draft malathion human health risk assessment. The availability of the draft assessment for this organophosphate pesticide was originally announced on September 15, 2016. The comment period will now close on December 21, 2016.

[Read the September 15 announcement.](#)

[Learn more about malathion.](#)

(EPA November 18, 2016)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-extends-comment-period-malathion-assessment>

EPA REGISTERS DICAMBA FORMULATION FOR USE ON DICAMBA TOLERANT CROPS

EPA is registering a dicamba formulation, Xtendimax™ with Vapor Grip™ Technology, which is specifically designed to have lower volatility, to control weeds in cotton and soybean crops genetically engineered to tolerate dicamba.

This registration is for a formulation of dicamba that contains an additive that reduces volatility. This formulation is different from the products that are alleged to have been recently used illegally. EPA continues to investigate these issues in several locations in the Midwest.

The label requires very specific and rigorous drift mitigation measures. Restrictions on the use of the product to further reduce the potential for exposure from spray drift include: no application from aircraft; no application when wind speed is over 15 mph; application only with approved nozzles at specified pressures; and buffer zones to protect sensitive areas when the wind is blowing toward them.

Weeds that are becoming increasingly resistant to glyphosate-based herbicides cause problems for farmers. This registration will provide an additional tool to reduce the spread of glyphosate resistant weeds. This final decision is designed to ensure that weed resistance is successfully managed, including reporting by the registrant to EPA of any suspected resistance, as well as remediation and grower education.

EPA is placing time limits on the registration to allow the Agency to either let it expire or to easily make the necessary changes in the registration if there are problems with resistant weeds or pesticide drift. Nevertheless, herbicide resistance is adequately addressed by the terms of the registration, and the Agency does not expect off-site incidents to occur.

This dicamba formula for use on dicamba-tolerant soybean and cotton has been registered for sale and use in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania,

South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

EPA proposed this decision on March 31, 2016. EPA's final regulatory decision and supporting documents, including a response to public comments, are available in docket number EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0187 at www.regulations.gov.

(EPA November 9, 2016)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-registers-dicamba-formulation-use-dicamba-tolerant-crops>

DRAFT RISK ASSESSMENTS NOW OPEN FOR COMMENT

EPA has released draft risk assessments for a number of pesticides, as part of the pesticide [registration review process](#). The public comment period for the following draft risk assessments, is now open. The comment period will close January 30, 2017.

The chemicals with draft human health and ecological risk assessments now open for public comment are: aliphatic esters, cyclanilide, cymoxanil, d-phenothrin, dimethomorph, fenpropathrin, imiprothrin, kresoxim-methyl, linuron, metalaxyl and mefenoxam, MGK-264, momfluorothrin, phosmet, prallethrin, tau-fluvalinate, tefluthrin, and tetramethrin. In addition, the following chemicals with only draft ecological risk assessments now open for public comment are: bifenthrin, cyfluthrins (& beta), cypermethrin (alpha & zeta), cyphenothrin, deltamethrin, esfenvalerate, etofenprox, flumethrin, gamma-cyhalothrin, lambda-cyhalothrin, permethrin, and pyrethrins.

Consult the [Federal Register Notice](#) at docket number EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0393 for a list of the chemicals and the associated docket numbers and for directions on how to submit comments on the draft risk assessments.

For more information and links to the dockets for these chemicals:

- [Open for Comment: Pesticide Actions and Documents](#)
- [Pyrethrins and Pyrethroids](#)

(EPA December 1, 2016)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/draft-risk-assessments-now-open-comment>

EPA ADDRESSES USE OF DRY ICE TO CONTROL RODENTS

As reported in the USA Today, EPA reached out to state agencies in Illinois, Massachusetts, New York and elsewhere in recent months to make clear that federal guidelines prohibit the use of dry ice for rat abatement because the deadly treatment is not registered with the federal agency as required.

A recent trend in big cities — including New York, Boston and Chicago — is the use of dry ice to control rat populations, but the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) says cities must stop the practice because it's illegal under federal law to use dry ice as a rodenticide (see related PCT story).

As reported in the USA Today, EPA reached out to state agencies in Illinois, Massachusetts, New York and elsewhere in recent months to make clear that federal guidelines prohibit the use of dry ice for rat abatement because the deadly treatment is not registered with the federal agency as required. The law is in place to ensure products are safe, and directions for use minimize risks to users, the public and the environment.

The article stated that this "revelation prompted Boston and New York to halt the use of dry ice in their rat abatement programs, while Chicago is investigating the issue. All three cities launched tests this year as urban centers around the country experienced a spike in the number of citizen complaints about rodents after a relatively warm winter." (PCT Online November 30, 2016) <http://www.pctonline.com/article/epa-dry-ice-control-rodents/>

LAWSUIT CHALLENGES MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MD.) LAWN CARE BAN

RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment) joined six local businesses and seven residents of Montgomery County, Maryland, in filing a lawsuit that challenges the passage of the county's lawn care product ban.

The complaint, filed in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, Md., is asking the court to declare that the law banning almost all lawn care products for private property is illegal as preempted by state law.

The suit arises from the October 2015 adoption of Bill 52-14 which prohibits the use of widely available lawn and garden products on private and county property by residents and professionals. The law goes into effect on January 1, 2018, for private property, improperly banning the use of hundreds of state-licensed lawn care products on private property throughout the county.

When Bill 52-14 was being debated by the County Council, the Maryland Attorney General's office, County Executive and members of the Council opined the law's private property provisions were likely preempted by state law.

"Our nearly two-year challenge to the passage of Bill 52-14 continues with today's court filing. Along with impacted county businesses and residents, we know this law is preempted by state law and are seeking confirmation from the court," said Aaron Hobbs, RISE president.

"Virtually everyone in the county will be affected by the private property lawn care ban with residents prohibited from treating their own properties with state-registered pesticides available from retailers, professionals left with virtually no pest solutions to treat residential and commercial lawns and turf, and retailers confused by a county law that unnecessarily differs from state law," added Hobbs.

Maryland law comprehensively and uniformly regulates the registration, sale, and use of pesticides

across the state. Uses of the pesticides that the ban would prohibit were already reviewed, licensed and approved by state regulators. (PCT Online November 23, 2016)

<http://www.pctonline.com/article/rise-lawsuit-lawn-care-ban-maryland/>

US LAWMAKERS BLAST EPA ATRAZINE REVIEW

More than 100 members of the US House of Representatives have weighed in with criticism of the EPA's ecological risk assessment for the herbicide, atrazine. In a letter sent to EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy, the lawmakers echo fears voiced by farmers and pesticide manufacturers who worry that the Agency has proposed a new level of concern that would effectively ban use of the herbicide.

The EPA's draft risk assessment for atrazine "throws its future use into doubt, an outcome that, according to many, may not be scientifically justified", according to the November 1st letter. "This criticism appears to be borne out by the Agency's approach, where it is setting standards on studies that the EPA's own Science Advisory Panel considered 'flawed' in 2012."

At issue is the draft ecological risk assessment for atrazine published by the EPA in June as part of the registration review for the herbicide. The Agency's prior review of atrazine was completed in 2003.

The new assessment found that there were "risk concerns" for mammals, birds, reptiles, plants and plant communities across the country for "many of the atrazine uses". Of major concern to atrazine users was the EPA's finding that its new level of concern for aquatic species was 3.4 ppb, far lower than the current level of 10 ppb. The EPA says that its assessment was based on an array of new information, including hundreds of toxicity studies,

updated aquatic exposure models and surface water monitoring data, but critics are not convinced.

But maize farmers, state agricultural officials and atrazine manufacturer Syngenta argued that the level was tantamount to a de-facto ban on atrazine. The lawmakers agree and say that it would have a "significant negative impact" on farmers and rural communities across the country. "It would be irresponsible to greatly restrict one of the safest and most trusted herbicides on the market," according to the letter, signed by 102 Republicans and four Democrats.

The lawmakers contend that new limits on atrazine would force farmers to rely on more expensive and environmentally harmful pesticides and undermine conservation efforts, such as no-till and strip-till.

The letter cites a study that suggests a ban on atrazine could cost growers up to \$59 per acre, an increase that would be "especially detrimental" to small family farms. "With this information in mind we ask that you take into account the needs of farmers and use sound science when finalising the ecological risk assessment for atrazine," the lawmakers state. "It is imperative that EPA take the science and public comments seriously and revise the preliminary ecological risk assessment using the best available data." (Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, November 4, 2016)

ZIKA SURFACES IN TEXAS

Texas has become the second state in the continental United States to confirm a locally transmitted case of the Zika virus, state and federal health officials said Monday. Lab results confirmed the virus in a non-pregnant female resident of Brownsville last week. She has not traveled to an area where the virus is circulating and has no other known exposure to the virus that would have put her at risk for infection.

Health officials said they are not surprised to confirm local transmission of this virus in South Texas, near the Mexico border.

"We knew it was only a matter of time before we saw a Zika case spread by a mosquito in Texas," state Health Commissioner Dr. John Hellerstedt said. He added that more cases are expected, but officials do not believe the virus will be widespread.

"Laboratory testing found genetic material from the Zika virus in the patient's urine, but a blood test was negative, indicating that the virus can no longer be spread from her by a mosquito," the Texas Department of State Health Services said in a statement.

It is, however, investigating where the woman became infected by testing mosquitoes found around her home and knocking on her neighbors' doors to request voluntary urine samples and other information to determine whether others are infected.

It is also sharing information about the virus and how to protect against it. This includes using mosquito repellent, wearing long sleeves, keeping windows closed, using air conditioning and eliminating standing water. Spraying has also been done in the area.

In addition to ongoing disease surveillance efforts, which are part of the state's Zika action plan, the state medical operations center has been activated to offer support through education and expertise as well as personnel and equipment resources.

The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is working with state and local officials to increase mosquito surveillance and vector control. The female *Aedes aegypti* mosquito, which lives in the area, is primarily responsible for the transmission of Zika, dengue virus and some other diseases. The related *Aedes albopictus* is also believed to transmit these diseases.

State health officials say travel across the border is frequent in the area. Zika transmission has been

reported in multiple communities on the Mexican side of the border.

"Even though it is late in the mosquito season, mosquitoes can spread Zika in some areas of the country," said Dr. Tom Frieden, director of the CDC. The weather and climate in Texas are conducive to year-round mosquito activity.

It is possible that someone could have Zika without knowing, since an estimated 80% of those infected have no symptoms. When symptoms occur, they can include fever, rash, joint pain and red eyes, and they can last from a few days to about a week.

Pregnant women are at greatest risk because they can unknowingly pass the virus to their fetus, leaving devastating consequences including miscarriage and neurological deficits that last a lifetime.

Because the virus can also be sexually transmitted, pregnant women or those trying to become pregnant should avoid unprotected sex with a partner who has been infected or who has lived in or traveled to an area where the virus is circulating, as recommended by the CDC.

There is no treatment or vaccine for Zika, although research efforts are underway to develop one.

The only other US state where the virus is known to be circulating is Florida, where state health officials are reporting 238 locally transmitted cases to date. (CNN, November 29, 2016)

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/28/health/texas-confirms-local-zika-transmission/index.html>

DOW AGROSCIENCES, U.S. FARMERS DISAGREE WITH EPA PROPOSAL TO REVOKE CHLORPYRIFOS TOLERANCES

In its release of a pre-publication copy of the Notice of Data Availability (NODA) related to its assessment of the human health risks associated with the insecticide chlorpyrifos, the U.S. EPA took

another step toward finalizing its proposal to revoke all food tolerances for this critical tool for U.S. agriculture.

"We disagree with the chlorpyrifos NODA and with key aspects of the underlying assessment," said Phil Jost, Dow AgroSciences Portfolio Marketing Leader, U.S. Crop Protection Insecticides. "The assessment lacks scientific rigor, is contrary to EPA and Administration policies of data access and transparency in scientific decision-making, and falls short of the FIFRA requirement that decisions be based on valid, complete and reliable scientific data. However, it is important to note this NODA is not a final decision."

Prior to the announcement, on October 30, 2015, EPA announced a proposal to revoke U.S. food tolerances for chlorpyrifos. This proposal was an outcome of a U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision ordering the EPA to respond to allegations about chlorpyrifos made in a 2007 petition. The EPA's proposal to revoke tolerances was made before the Agency had finished its formal health and safety evaluations of chlorpyrifos. Dow AgroSciences stated that it remains confident that authorized uses of chlorpyrifos products, as directed, offer wide margins of protection for human health and safety.

Dow AgroSciences is concerned that the NODA cannot be reconciled with the requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Agency's own guidelines, policies and procedures.

According to Dow AgroSciences, chlorpyrifos is a critical tool for growers of more than 50 different types of crops in the U.S. For many important pests, growers face limited or no viable alternatives to chlorpyrifos. When an outbreak of a new pest occurs, growers look to chlorpyrifos as a proven first-line of defense.

The EPA will be opening a 60-day public comment period for the NODA and indicated this to be the last opportunity for stakeholders to express their need for chlorpyrifos and call for EPA to rely on sound and transparent science and regulatory process.

The court ordered EPA to make a final decision on the petition by March 31, 2017, but did not specify what that decision should be. The EPA can deny the petition and retain all tolerances, which would be consistent with the science and allow the Agency to complete its registration review and address their remaining concerns in an orderly manner.

(CropLife, November 11, 2016)

<http://www.croplife.com/crop-inputs/insecticides/dow-agrosciences-u-s-farmers-disagree-with-epa-proposal-to-revoke-chlorpyrifos-tolerances/>

MAJOR REVIEW FINDS NEONIC POSES LOW RISK TO AQUATIC INVERTEBRATES

A major new ecotoxicological review and risk assessment has been published in the peer-reviewed literature and concluded that registered crop and non-crop uses of imidacloprid in the United States are of minimal risk to sensitive aquatic invertebrate communities. This is also good news for other wildlife, such as birds and fish, since these insects are an important part of their diet.

The neonicotinoid imidacloprid is one of the most widely-used insecticides in the world because of its effectiveness and its relatively favorable human and environmental safety profile. Because aquatic invertebrates serve an important function in nature, many studies have been performed to characterize the potential impact across a variety of species. The publication details the body of research, the careful selection and use of the best available data, and the probabilistic risk assessment. The probabilistic approach better predicts the effects to sensitive species, the relevant exposures and the potential risks to aquatic invertebrate communities in terms of the actual label use directions and the natural environment for these crops and treated landscapes.

The researchers found that higher-tier studies provide the most robust data for regulatory decision making. “Laboratory testing is necessary to establish toxicity endpoints for a wide range of

organisms, however such studies have unrealistic exposure conditions which often lead to overestimated toxicity. Fortunately, we had data from many higher-tier mesocosm studies for imidacloprid, which is almost unprecedented,” said Dr. Dwayne Moore, Senior VP and Scientist at Intrinsic Environmental Sciences (US) Corp., one of the researchers involved in the review. “The higher tier studies enabled us to look at aquatic invertebrate communities containing a wide array of invertebrate species in realistic environmental settings, which is far more predictive of the biological realities of aquatic ecosystems than are tests on single species in artificial environments in the laboratory.”

In the assessment, refined exposure models that better represent pest treatments and the environments where applications could be made were used. The researchers found that their aquatic exposure predictions were consistent with a decade of water sampling data available from public sources, including the U.S. Geological Survey. “We conducted 30-year simulations based on realistic, but conservative, assumptions and found that aquatic communities are unlikely to be at risk from acute or chronic exposures to registered uses of imidacloprid,” noted Dr. Moore. “In fact, risks were de minimis, the lowest possible category, for all crop and non-crop uses.” (CropLife, November 28, 2016) <http://www.croplife.com/crop-inputs/insecticides/major-review-finds-neonic-poses-low-risk-to-aquatic-invertebrates/>

MONSANTO: NEWS STORY QUESTIONING GMO BENEFITS USED 'CHERRY-PICKED' DATA

Monsanto, the multi-national agrochemical and biotechnology company, has delivered a lengthy and strong response to a recent article in the New York Times questioning the yields and other benefits of genetically modified crops (GMOs).

The article compared crop yields in North America and Europe, and concluded there was no "discernible advantage" to planting GMOs, which are largely banned in western Europe.

In a response posted on the company's website by Nick Weber, a member of the company's social media team, Monsanto said the Times story chose to "cherry-pick data" and that the arguments "were misinformed."

"We were disappointed to read this weekend's piece on GMO crops in the New York Times, titled 'Doubts About the Promised Bounty of Genetically Modified Crops,'" Weber said.

"The reporter chose to cherry-pick data to argue that GMOs have failed to provide significant benefits, especially yield increases, to farmers in the United States," Weber said.

The piece said the arguments by the reporter, Danny Hakim, "were misinformed" and "overlooked the perspectives of millions of farmers in the United States, India, South America and elsewhere in the world who have chosen to plant GMOs."

The story said genetic modification in the U.S. and Canada "has not accelerated increases in crop yields or led to an overall reduction in the use of chemical pesticides."

The Times analysis was based on United Nations data showing that the U.S and Canada have "gained no discernible advantage in yields — food per acre — when measured against Western Europe, a region with comparably modernized agricultural producers like France and Germany."

But Monsanto argued in turn: "Analyzing yield trends across geographies is complex because agronomic characteristics, maturity rates and other factors have to be taken into consideration."

Monsanto said the report used apples-and-oranges comparisons.

"Making comparisons across very broad geographies — such as the United States and Europe — is especially difficult," Weber said. "Focusing on

a comparison between smaller regions allows for better control of those variables and a more accurate comparison."

Weber cited an analysis by Monsanto's chief technology officer, Dr. Robb Fraley, which looked at trends between the Canadian province of Ontario and France.

"These two regions are agronomically similar," Weber said. "The big difference? GMOs are common in Ontario, but not used in France. From 1997 to 2015, corn yields increased in Ontario by 51 percent, while French yields only grew about 10.5 percent."

Weber said GMO benefits can't be disputed.

"It's easy for anyone to cherry-pick numbers to make a misleading argument, but it's impossible to argue with the real-world benefits both large and small farmers have seen around the world."

The New York Times article also said herbicide use has increased in the U.S, and that the country "has fallen behind Europe's biggest producer, France, in reducing the overall use of pesticides, which includes both herbicides and insecticides."

Weber, however, cited a recent PG economics study that found GMOs have reduced pesticide spraying by 8.2 percent between 1996 and 2015.

PG also reported that in 2014, conservation tillage enabled by glyphosate-tolerant GMO corn and soybeans removed 22.4 billion kilograms of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Weber said.

"That's the equivalent of taking 10 million cars off the road for a year," Weber said. "That benefit alone should make headlines." (Crop Protection News November 15, 2016)

<http://cropprotectionnews.com/stories/511044933-monsanto-news-story-questioning-gmo-benefits-used-cherry-picked-data>

CEU Meetings

Date: December 13-14, 2016

Title: OSU Winter Crop School

Location: Wes Watkins Center Stillwater OK

Contact: Dr. Brian Arnall 405-744-1722

Course #: OK-16-

CEU's: Category(s):

3 1A

3 10

Date: February 14, 2017

Title: Ensystem 2017 OK CEU Workshop

Location: La Quinta Paris TX

Contact: Donald Stetler Jr. (281) 217-2965

Course #: OK-16-

www.ensystem.com

CEU's: Category(s):

1 3A

3 7A

1 7B

Date: March 28, 2017

Title: Ensystem 2017 OK CEU Workshop

Location: Holiday Inn Express 102 St Tulsa

Contact: Donald Stetler Jr. (281) 217-2965

Course #: OK-16-

www.ensystem.com

CEU's: Category(s):

1 3A

3 7A

1 7B

Date: March 29, 2017

Title: Ensystem 2017 OK CEU Workshop

Location: Holiday Inn Express Midwest City Ok

Contact: Donald Stetler Jr. (281) 217-2965

Course #: OK-16-

www.ensystem.com

CEU's: Category(s):

1 3A

3 7A

1 7B

ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

PestED.com

<https://www.pested.com/>

CEU School

<http://www.ceuschool.org/>

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.oda.state.ok.us/cps-ceuhome1.htm>

ODAFF Test Information

Pesticide applicator test sessions dates and locations for December/January are as follows:

December		January	
1	Tulsa	10	McAlester
2	OKC	10	OKC
6	Goodwell	11	Lawton
6	McAlester	12	Tulsa
8	Lawton	17	Ardmore
15	Tulsa	23	OKC
15	Enid	26	Tulsa
16	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: Arcadia Conservation Education
Building 7201 E 33rd St. Edmond
OK (**New Location**)

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

<h2>Pesticide Safety Education Program</h2>
