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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.

OCTOBER TEST HELP SESSION

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program will conduct the next test help sessions in October. The first workshop will be held October 15th at the Oklahoma County Extension Center 930 N Portland in Oklahoma City.

A second October help session will be in Tulsa on October 28th at the Tulsa County Extension Center 4116 E. 15th.
These testing 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.

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

**ODAFF Testing fees are not included in the registration fee and must be paid separately.**

Register online at the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) website at http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm. Registration forms can also be downloaded from the website.

Registration will start at 8:45 and the program will run from 9:00 am to 12:30 pm at both locations. Testing will begin at 1:30 pm.

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

The last Test Help Workshop date for 2014 will be December 16 in OKC. http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm

**EPA SETTLES WITH DUPONT OVER VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL PESTICIDE LAWS THAT LED TO WIDESPREAD TREE DEATHS AND DAMAGE**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) today announced a settlement with the E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company (DuPont) for alleged violations of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). DuPont will pay a $1,853,000 penalty to resolve allegations that the company failed to submit reports to EPA about potential adverse effects of an herbicide product called Imprelis, and sold it with labeling that did not ensure its safe use. When customers applied the misbranded Imprelis product, it led to widespread death and damage to trees.

"EPA’s ability to protect the public from dangerous pesticides depends on companies complying with the legal obligation to disclose information on the harmful effects of chemicals," said Cynthia Giles, EPA Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance. “This case sends the message that illegally withholding required information will be treated as a very serious violation."

As part of the registration process for a pesticide or herbicide, FIFRA requires companies to submit to EPA reports on a product’s potential adverse impacts on plants or animals that it is not intended to control. During the registration process and after registration was approved for Imprelis, an herbicide product intended to control weeds like dandelions, clover, thistle, plantains and ground ivy, DuPont failed to submit 18 reports.

As a result, Imprelis – as it was registered and labeled – did not adequately protect against damage to certain tree species. DuPont made 320 shipments of Imprelis to distributors in 2010 and 2011. This failure to submit reports and the sale or distribution of a misbranded pesticide or herbicide are violations of FIFRA.

DuPont has submitted over 7,000 reports to EPA of damage or death of trees – primarily Norway spruce and white pine – related to the application of Imprelis. Test data from DuPont confirmed certain coniferous trees, including Norway spruce and balsam fir, as susceptible to being damaged or killed by the application of Imprelis. There is also evidence that non-coniferous trees such as maple, honey locusts, lilacs, sycamores, and alders are susceptible to damage from Imprelis.

Starting in June 2011, EPA began receiving complaints from state pesticide agencies regarding damage to trees related to the use of Imprelis when it was applied to control weeds. Cases of tree damage and death from Imprelis were widespread in the Midwest, especially Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. Indiana
investigated more than 400 cases of tree damage related to Imprelis in 2011.

In August 2011, EPA ordered DuPont to stop selling and distributing Imprelis without prior approval from EPA. In September 2011, the registration for Imprelis was amended to prohibit the sale, distribution or marketing of Imprelis. The product registration for Imprelis expired on September 8th, 2014, and DuPont is no longer selling the product.

Imprelis was distributed and sold in 1 gallon, 2.5 gallon and 4.5 ounce containers, primarily to pest control professionals servicing the lawn, golf, turf and weed control sectors.

Imprelis was registered with EPA in 2010, and was marketed by DuPont for lawn and turf applications on residential and commercial lawns, golf courses, sod farms, schools, parks, and athletic fields.

The settlement, a consent agreement and final order, will be filed at EPA’s regional office in Philadelphia, and DuPont must submit payment of the penalty to the U.S. Department of Treasury within 30 days.

For more information about this settlement, click here: http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/ei-du-pont-de-nemours-and-company-settlement

(EPA September 15, 2014)
http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/596e17d7cac720848525781f0043629e/c7b2b4f94c0f3a0285257d54005ca7da!opendocument

EPA REGISTERS NEW NEMATICIDE ALTERNATIVE TO RESTRICTED-USE SOIL FUMIGANTS, INCLUDING METHYL BROMIDE

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is registering a new active ingredient, fluensulfone, a non-fumigant nematicide that provides lower-risk chemical control of nematodes than methyl bromide and other Restricted Use soil fumigants. Under the Montreal Protocol, EPA has phased out methyl bromide because its use depletes the ozone layer.

Nematodes are difficult to control and can cause significant economic damage by reducing crop yield and quality. Fluensulfone is a nematicide for pre-plant, bare-soil application on fruiting vegetables and cucurbits – cucumbers, melons, squash, tomatoes, okra, eggplant and peppers.

Of the seven main alternatives to fluensulfone used in the last five years, six (including methyl bromide) are soil fumigants and the seventh is a carbamate. All seven are Restricted Use Pesticides, which may pose a greater risk to human health than fluensulfone.

Restricted Use Pesticides require special applicator training and certification, reporting and record-keeping and additional restrictive labeling to protect against human exposure. Soil fumigants can be labor intensive, requiring tarping and posting of fields.

With its evaluation, EPA confirms that when used in accordance with the newly approved label, fluensulfone meets the safety requirements in the law.

(EPA September 12, 2014)
http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/bd4379a92ceceeeac8525735900400c27/71820c055c72619185257d510056dbccfOpenDocument

CLIMATE, GENETICS CAN AFFECT HOW LONG VIRUS-CARRYING MOSQUITOES LIVE

The longer a mosquito lives, the better its odds of transmitting disease to humans or animals. But as it turns out, factors such as the mosquito’s own genetics and the climate it lives in have a big – albeit complicated and not wholly understood – role to play in its lifespan.

University of Florida researchers, hoping to better understand how West Nile virus affects mosquitoes,
set up an experiment they outline in a recent Journal of Vector Ecology issue.

Mosquitoes can transmit any number of pathogens to humans, including protozoan malaria, West Nile, dengue and chikungunya viruses. Malaria cases range between 350 million and 500 million each year, with 1 million to 3 million deaths every year.

In the experiment, UF researchers examined survival rates for mosquitoes from two laboratory-reared colonies, one from Gainesville and one from Vero Beach.

Half of each of the mosquito colonies was fed West Nile virus-infected blood, the other half kept as a control population, and fed blood without the virus.

They divided the groups once more, this time keeping the mosquitoes at two temperatures, one group at 80.6°F, the other at 87.8°F – a rather large difference in temperature for cold-blooded insects.

Their findings were both unexpected and illuminating, said Barry Alto, a UF assistant professor of arbovirology based at the Florida Medical Entomology Laboratory in Vero Beach.

“Our results indicate that interactions between mosquitoes and arboviruses are really complex … these things that haven’t really been taken into account previously might make a difference,” said Alto, part of UF’s Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.

The researchers found that warmer temperature shortened survival. Also, for the most part, the Vero Beach mosquitoes lived longer than those from Gainesville, indicating that some groups, or strains, of mosquitoes might just be genetically hardier than others.

They found that in general, the mosquitoes fared better at cooler temperatures.

But they also found that the West Nile virus-carrying mosquitoes from Gainesville fared worse than their counterparts at the hotter temperatures, and to their surprise, that the Vero Beach-bred mosquitoes carrying West Nile virus lived longer than all other groups at the cooler temperature, including control-group mosquitoes not exposed to the virus.

Ingesting virus-infected blood may take a toll on the mosquito’s health, Alto said, but it’s clear that other factors: immune response, genetics and the environment, are also at play and need more study.

“It’s quite complex, there’s a lot of stuff going on here,” Alto said. “But I think the take-home message is that these viruses, when they’re in mosquitoes, not only can they alter parameters like survivorship that are really important to disease transmission, but they can alter them in non-intuitive ways — sometimes enhancing, sometimes decreasing survivorship, and that those situations arise when you start considering other factors of the environment, like temperature.”

Adding to scientists’ knowledge base of how disease affects insects is key to finding the best ways to limit its spread, Alto said.

“In the most general sense, in order for humans to control disease, we really need to know how the mosquito interacts with these viruses,” he said. “In the absence of a human vaccine, the best way to control any sort of mosquito-borne virus is to control the mosquito. Simply put, if the mosquito doesn’t bite you, you’re not going to get the pathogen.”

Besides Alto, the research team included Stephanie Richards, an assistant professor at East Carolina University; Sheri Anderson, a former graduate student at the Florida Medical Entomology Lab and Cynthia Lord, an associate professor in modeling of vector-borne disease transmission, also of the FMEL. The study was funded by the National Institutes of Health and UF/IFAS.

(PCT Online, September 11, 2014)
US ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS REVIVE CHLORPYRIFOS CHALLENGE

A coalition of US environmentalist advocacy groups has returned to federal court in a third bid to force the EPA to ban the insecticide, chlorpyrifos. The suit, filed in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, continues a long-running quarrel over a petition filed with the Agency in September 2007 by Pesticide Action Network North America and the Natural Resources Defense Council seeking an outright ban on chlorpyrifos and a revocation of all food tolerances for the organophosphate insecticide.

The pesticide has an array of uses, including applications to maize, cotton, fruit trees and other food and field crops, golf courses and for mosquito control. The EPA estimates some 5 million pounds (2.2 million kg) of the insecticide are applied to US crops annually and contends that legal agricultural uses are safe.

But the Agency acknowledges that chlorpyrifos can pose serious human health risks, including respiratory, reproductive and neurological damage. Most residential uses were phased out under an agreement with registrants in 2000.

The environmentalist groups first sued the EPA in July 2010, arguing the Agency had failed to respond to its 2007 petition in a timely manner (Agrow No 597, p 15). The litigation prompted an agreement that the EPA would conduct a preliminary human health risk assessment by June 2011 and respond to the petition by November 2011. The assessment was completed, but the formal response never came, according to the NGOs, who returned to the Court in April 2012 to require the EPA to respond.

But the 9th Circuit concluded in July 2013 that the Agency had laid out a reasonable plan for responding to the petition, citing the EPA’s promise to respond by February 2014.

In the new suit, the plaintiffs say that deadline has come and gone without action by the Agency. “EPA has initiated several processes to assess the health risks posed by chlorpyrifos as presented in the 2007 petition and has released some partial responses that address discrete contentions,” the plaintiffs say. “However, it has yet to issue a final and reviewable decision.” The Agency has made commitments over the past seven years to the plaintiffs and the courts “to resolve the 2007 petition and decide whether to ban chlorpyrifos by various deadlines”, according to the new complaint. “Without fail, EPA has violated these commitments.”

The plaintiffs are asking the Court to find that the EPA has “unreasonably delayed fulfilling its legal obligations” and to order the Agency to issue a decision on the 2007 petition by next year.

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, September 25, 2014)

CARGILL SUES SYNGENTA OVER GM MAIZE

US grain trading company Cargill has filed a lawsuit against Syngenta Seeds for damages from the commercialization of its genetically modified insect-resistant Agrisure Viptera (MIR162) maize before obtaining import approval from China. The lawsuit was filed in the state of Louisiana. Cargill’s export facilities in Reserve and Westwego, Louisiana loaded the vessels that were destined for and rejected by China, the company points out.

China has rejected imports of US maize since November 2013 due to the presence of the MIR162 trait, virtually halting the US maize trade with China, Cargill notes. A study by the National Grain and Feed Association estimates that US exporters and farmers have lost up to $2.9 billion because of the uncertain trade environment, it adds. A group of US senators representing major farm states has written to the Obama Administration urging it to expedite efforts to address China’s rejection of US grain exports (Agrow No 696, p 12).

Cargill maintains that Syngenta has not practiced responsible stewardship by broadly commercializing a new product before receiving approval in a key export market such as China.
"Syngenta has also put the ability of US agriculture to serve global markets at risk, costing both Cargill and the entire US agricultural industry significant damages," says Mark Stonacek, president of Cargill Grain & Oilseed Supply Chain North America. The company stresses its support for the development of GM seed but maintains that Syngenta's actions are inconsistent with industry standards and the conduct of other seed companies.

The lawsuit was filed after talks with Syngenta were unproductive, Mr Stonacek notes. "Marketing MIR162 before receiving approval from China closed off that significant export market to US farmers and exporters. Cargill believes that Syngenta continues to not accept its role in shared responsibility by moving ahead with the commercialization of Duracade [5222], which is also not approved in China and other key export markets," Mr Stonacek says.

Cargill was one of three major US grain handlers this year to refuse deliveries of Duracade maize until it is approved by China and other major export markets (Agrow No 683, p 15). Syngenta entered into an agreement with US distribution company Gavilon Grain to enable farmers to plant Duracade maize with the assurance that there would be a market for it (Agrow No 683, p 2). Syngenta and Gavilon have extended that agreement to 2015, with an increased number of accepting locations.

**Syngenta response**

Syngenta believes that the lawsuit is without merit and "strongly upholds the right of growers to have access to approved new technologies that can increase both their productivity and their profitability", it says. The MIR162 trait was approved for cultivation in the US in 2010 and Syngenta has commercialized it "in full compliance with regulatory and legal requirements". It also obtained import approvals from major maize importing countries. "Syngenta has been fully transparent in commercializing the trait over the past four years," the company states. During that time, Agrisure Viptera has "demonstrated major benefits for growers, preventing significant yield and grain quality losses resulting from damage to a broad spectrum of lepidopteran pests."
concluding it was an "isolated incident" and finding no evidence of any GM wheat in commerce. The agency was unable to determine how the unapproved trait came to grow in the Oregon field, but says that the GM wheat found this summer in Montana was not the source. Although the wheat found in Oregon and Montana were both Monsanto's Roundup Ready strain, they were otherwise genetically different, according to the APHIS, which released more than 12,000 pages of its investigation.

The APHIS says that the new investigation in Montana has prompted it to take several additional steps to ensure that unintended GM wheat is not growing in other US locations where field trials are taking place or have recently occurred. The agency has committed to inspect newly planted field trials and follow up with post-harvest inspections to ensure compliance with requirements that volunteer plants are removed. The APHIS says that it will also conduct some post-harvest volunteer monitoring inspections of GM wheat field trials that were planted in 2012 and 2013.

Monsanto, which is in the process of settling a class action lawsuit brought by wheat farmers who suffered economic harm from the Oregon incident (Agrow No 672, p 16), welcomes the APHIS' findings. The company says that the end of the investigation "provides closure for the wheat industry."

The US Wheat Associates and National Association of Wheat Growers echo that view, highlighting the finding that "there is no indication that any wheat with this regulated trait has entered the commercial supply chain."

Critics of GM crops, however, criticise the USDA for its dual announcement and say that the new discovery warrants a moratorium on open-air field trials. "Just as USDA closes one fruitless investigation, it tries to bury the story of yet another contamination," says Andrew Kimbrell, executive director for the Center for Food Safety. "USDA cannot keep treating these as isolated incidents - contamination is the inevitable outcome of [GM] crop technology."

Last year, a coalition of environmental groups and organic interests led by the CFS sent a letter to Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack calling for stricter regulation of field trials of new GM crops to protect US farmers and preserve the $8 billion export market for conventional wheat (Agrow No 671, p 8).

(Pesticide & Chemical Policy/AGROW, September 29, 2014)

POLICE OFFICER HOSPITALIZED AFTER 100+ YELLOWJACKET STINGS

A Brookhaven police officer was rushed to the hospital after a swarm of yellow jackets attacked him during a chase Wednesday, WSBTV reported.

DeKalb County police say the suspect hit a squad car on Interstate 85 and ran into a wooded area in Brookhaven's jurisdiction.

That's where the officer and his K-9 stepped into trouble.

"They stepped into a yellow jacket's nest and they were immediately covered by hundreds, if not thousands of yellow jackets," said Brookhaven Police Maj. Brandon Gurley.

The suspect was found in a ravine complaining about an injury from a fall. Police identified him as 37-year-old Brian Gutierrez.

Officials said the officer, identified as John Ritch, suffered about 100 stings. (PCT Online, September 26, 2014 http://www.pctonline.com/police-officer-yellowjacket-sting.aspx)
FALL HERBICIDE APPLICATIONS MORE EFFECTIVELY MANAGE RESISTANT ITALIAN RYEGRASS

Italian ryegrass has shown resistance to five different herbicide modes of action in the U.S. Growers in the Midsouth are seeking new ways to control this threat to crop yields. Field studies show that a fall application of certain herbicides before weed emergence, leads to more successful crop planting and weed control in spring.

The article “Glyphosate-Resistant Italian Ryegrass (Lolium perenne ssp. multiflorum) Control with Fall-Applied Residual Herbicides,” in the current issue of Weed Technology presents results of field tests to determine the most effective timing of residual herbicides for control of glyphosate-resistant Italian ryegrass. Although grown for winter pasture and soil stabilization, Italian ryegrass has easily escaped cultivation, becoming problematic along roadsides and in cereal, vegetable, and grass crops.

“Glyphosate-resistant Italian ryegrass represents a serious threat to crop production systems in the Midsouth,” said Jason A. Bond, an associate researcher and extension professor at Mississippi State University and lead author of the study. “The presence of this weed also jeopardizes traditional glyphosate-based burndown programs. Management of glyphosate-resistant Italian ryegrass requires a multifaceted approach. Herbicide options are limited and Italian ryegrass has a history of rapidly developing resistance to multiple herbicide chemistries.”

If glyphosate-resistant Italian ryegrass is not controlled when fields are burned down, significant plant residue will be present at planting, competing with crop seedlings and hindering herbicide programs. The current study found that an effective management program for glyphosate-resistant Italian ryegrass starts with the application of herbicide prior to emergence, between mid-October and mid-November. Residual herbicides, such as S-metolachlor, trifluralin, and clomazone, can provide control until spring, depending on fall and winter rainfall.

What crops are to be planted in the spring must be considered when selecting a fall residual herbicide. Only S-metolachlor herbicides can be safely used in a field where corn will be planted, and only clomazone is appropriate for rice crops. S-metolachlor and trifluralin herbicides can be used prior to planting cotton or soybean crops.


(Croplife.com May 14, 2014)
http://www.croplife.com/crop-inputs/herbicides/fall-herbicide-applications-more-effectively-manage-resistant-italian-ryegrass/
In-State and Neighboring CEU Meetings

Date: October 14, 2014
Title: Red River Rights of Way and Bareground Workshop
Location: Courtyard by Marriott Norman OK
Contact: Phillip Lawrence (580) 235-5194
Course #: OK-14-112
www.rrsi.com

CEU's: Category(s):
6 6
6 10

Date: October 14, 2014
Title: Winfield Academy
Location: Reed Center Midwest City OK
Contact: Dana Ellis (763) 971-7958
Course #: OK-14-122
www.winfieldacademy.com

CEU's: Category(s):
15 3A
2 3B
6 3C
2 5
2 6
2 7A
1 7B
1 8
20 10

Date: November 3-5, 2014
Title: Oklahoma Ag Expo
Location: Reed Center Midwest City OK
Contact: Tammy Ford-Miller
Course #: OK-14-125

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

Date: November 11, 2014
Title: Target Specialty Products Tulsa Pest Management Meeting 2014
Location: Hard Rock Hotel and Casino Catoosa OK
Contact: Jennifer Gonzalez (800) 352-3870
Course #: OK-14-119
www.target-specialty.com

CEU's: Category(s):
2 3A
4 7A
2 7B
1 7C
2 8
6 10
1 11
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 October/November 2014 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKC</td>
<td>McAlester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atoka</td>
<td>Goodwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKC</td>
<td>OKC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></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