

# PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University  
<http://pested.okstate.edu>



April, 2020

CHEM

- 1 CHANGES FOR OSU PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM DURING COVID-19 STATE OF EMERGENCY
- 2 DICAMBA TRAINING
- 2 EPA CONTINUES EFFORTS TO HELP INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY OF DISINFECTANT PRODUCTS FOR USE AGAINST THE NOVEL CORONAVIRUS
- 3 EPA GLYPHOSATE DECISION CHALLENGED
- 4 ESA: TO PREVENT TICK ENCOUNTERS, WATCH WHERE YOU DUMP YOUR LEAVES
- 5 CALIFORNIA REFUTES US EPA SUPPORT OF BAYER'S GLYPHOSATE CANCER VERDICT
- 6 RESEARCH COMPARES MICRORATES OF DICAMBA AND 2,4-D
- 8 RATS ON THE RISE IN NEW ORLEANS' STREETS DUE TO COVID-19 PRECAUTIONS
- 8 FED WATCHDOG EYES DICAMBA
- 10 CEU MEETINGS
- 10 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 11 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

## CHANGES FOR OSU PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM DURING COVID-19 STATE OF EMERGENCY

Oklahoma State Pesticide Safety Education Program in accordance with the Governors orders for social distancing will now be working from home during the COVID-19 state of emergency. We will still provide help and information on pesticides by phone or email and other electronic options.

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

Kevin Shelton  
 405-744-1060 [kevin.shelton@okstate.edu](mailto:kevin.shelton@okstate.edu)  
 or  
 Charles Luper  
 405-744-5808 [charles.luper@okstate.edu](mailto:charles.luper@okstate.edu)

For updated information please check our webpage at <http://pested.okstate.edu> or follow us on Twitter @OkstatePestEd.

Testing at PSI test centers has been postponed. With information changing often please consult the PSI test center for available dates once testing becomes available again. <http://www.psiexams.com/> or <http://pested.okstate.edu/html/new-odaff-testing-procedure> (OSU PSEP)

## DICAMBA TRAINING

Upcoming Dicamba trainings from OSU Extension will be offered through the internet using Zoom.

Dicamba products that are Restricted Use Pesticides for use on dicamba resistant crops requires annual training. These products XtendiMax®, Engenia®, FeXapan™, and Tavium® all require documented dicamba training before use.

Dates and times are listed below:

April 2 @ 7pm

April 6 @ 7pm

April 9 @ 11:30am

You can watch at home or on mobile device.

Click here for more info on accessing Zoom:

<https://t.co/EiVaMH1MIU?amp=1>

(OSU PSEP)

## EPA CONTINUES EFFORTS TO HELP INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY OF DISINFECTANT PRODUCTS FOR USE AGAINST THE NOVEL CORONAVIRUS

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) took steps to provide additional flexibilities to manufacturers of disinfectants and other pesticides. EPA intends for these flexibilities to increase the availability of products for Americans to use against the novel coronavirus. After meeting with stakeholders last week and discussing supply chain challenges posed by the pandemic, EPA is allowing manufacturers to obtain certain inert ingredients—or inactive ingredients like sodium chloride or glucose—from different suppliers without checking with the agency for approval.

“EPA is committed to doing our part to help ensure American families, communities, business and

hospitals have access to as many effective surface disinfectant products as possible,” said EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler. “There is no higher priority for the Trump Administration than protecting the health and safety of Americans, and the steps we are taking today are helping put more products on the shelves without sacrificing important public health and environmental protections.”

Commodity inert ingredients are individual inert ingredients—there are approximately 280 total—that can be obtained from different producers with no significant differences in the ingredient. Applicants for pesticide registration or registration amendments can obtain commodity inert ingredients from various commercial sources without having to provide EPA with the supplier name and address. Only those inert ingredients designated as commodity inert ingredients would be eligible for this reduced Confidential Statement of Formula (CSF) reporting.

The agency is also continuing to expedite the review of submissions from companies requesting to add emerging viral pathogen claims to their already registered surface disinfectant labels. In many cases, the agency continues to be able to approve claims within 14 days, as resources allow, compared to the 90-day window these claims typically take. Today, EPA added 70 new surface disinfectants to EPA’s [List N: Disinfectants for Use Against SARS-CoV-2](#) (List N), bringing the total number of products on the list to more than 350.

It is important to note that List N only includes surface disinfectants registered by EPA. Other disinfection products like hand sanitizers and body wipes are regulated the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Using an EPA-registered product in ways other than what is specified in the label is against the law and unsafe.

For more information about EPA’s List of commodity inert ingredients, visit: <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/commodity-inert-ingredients>

For information and guidance on alcohol-based hand sanitizer products, please see FDA's website: <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-provides-guidance-production-alcohol-based-hand-sanitizer-help-boost>

For EPA's coronavirus website, visit: <https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus>.

(EPA March 26, 2020)  
<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-continues-efforts-help-increase-availability-disinfectant-products-use-against>

## **EPA GLYPHOSATE DECISION CHALLENGED**

EPA's interim registration approval of glyphosate in January now faces its first court challenge, as a number of food safety, farm worker and environmental groups have asked a federal appeals court to review the decision.

The Rural Coalition, Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Farmworker Association of Florida, Beyond Pesticides and the Center for Food Safety filed a petition for review with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco.

The groups allege EPA violated the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, and violated the agency's duties in the Endangered Species Act by not consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service before issuing the decision.

EPA finalized the decision on glyphosate, again stating the herbicide poses no risk to human health and can be used safely with certain drift mitigation requirements.

The agency first proposed the interim measure in April 2019 and accepted public comments until September 2019.

"After a thorough review of the best available science, as required under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, EPA has concluded that there are no risks of concern to human health when glyphosate is used according to the label, and that it is not a carcinogen," the EPA said in a January news release.

The herbicide's registration review, which started in 2009, is likely to push on into 2021, according to EPA's website.

In the meantime, the interim decision brings some regulatory clarity to American farmers and chemical companies, amid a storm of global scrutiny of the chemical and a steady march of lawsuits against the herbicide Roundup and its registrant, Bayer.

In early February, both sides in the Wade v. Bayer glyphosate case agreed to an indefinite continuance in the trial to allow settlement talks to continue.

The St. Louis, Missouri, case in the 22nd Circuit Court was near completion and about to be turned over to the jury to decide whether glyphosate, and specifically Roundup, led to the non-Hodgkin's lymphoma suffered by the three plaintiffs. This is the first multi-plaintiff case and the fourth case to reach the courtroom around the carcinogenic potential of the widely used herbicide.

Bayer lost all three previous cases and was ordered to pay tens of millions of dollars in damages.

Bayer acquired Roundup brands as part of its \$63 billion purchase of Monsanto. Bayer continues to maintain that glyphosate is safe; regularly pointing out that the EPA and many other country regulatory agencies support glyphosate's continued use.

Agricultural crops genetically engineered to withstand glyphosate have greatly expanded use of the chemistry since 1996. Glyphosate is used also in forestry, urban, lawn and garden applications. Bayer also had glyphosate in its portfolio before acquiring Monsanto.

That broad use has drawn worldwide attention to the herbicide and its safety.

Though glyphosate was developed by Monsanto, it is off-patent and sold by many agriculture companies as one of the most widely used herbicides in the world. It came to market in 1974 under Monsanto's Roundup label for control of perennial and annual weeds in non-crop and industrial areas. In 2018, California regulators failed in an attempt to label glyphosate products as "known to cause cancer."

(Progressive Farmer, March 23, 2020)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/03/23/lawsuit-alleges-agency-violated-act>

## **ESA: TO PREVENT TICK ENCOUNTERS, WATCH WHERE YOU DUMP YOUR LEAVES**

If you cleared fallen leaves from your lawn last fall, did you deposit them along the edge of your lawn, where grass meets woods? If you did, you might have unwittingly created an ideal habitat for blacklegged ticks.

In areas of the United States where ticks that carry Lyme disease-causing bacteria are prevalent, residential properties often intermingle with forested areas, and ticks thrive in the "edge habitats" where lawn and woods meet. While many homeowners heed the advice to clear their lawns of fallen leaves in autumn to avoid creating tick-friendly habitat in high-use areas, a new study on tick abundance in leaf litter says raking or blowing leaves just out to the forest edge is not enough.

"Our study showed that the common fall practice of blowing or raking leaves removed from lawns and landscaping to the immediate lawn/woodland edges can result in a three-fold increase in blacklegged tick numbers in these areas the following spring," says Robert Jordan, Ph.D., research scientist at the Monmouth County (New Jersey) Mosquito Control

Division and co-author of the study published in the Journal of Medical Entomology.

Instead, Jordan and co-author Terry Schulze, Ph.D., an independent medical entomologist, suggest homeowners either take advantage of municipal curbside leaf pickup (if available), compost their leaves, or remove leaves to a location further into the woods or further away from high-use areas on their property. "The thing homeowners need to keep in mind is that accumulations of leaves and other plant debris provide ideal host-seeking and survival conditions for immature blacklegged ticks," says Jordan.

In their new study, Jordan and Schulze set up test plots on three residential properties in Monmouth County, New Jersey, in the fall of 2017 and 2018. Each property had plots at both the forest edge and deeper within the wooded area. Some edge plots were allowed to accumulate leaves naturally, while others received additional leaves via periodic raking or leaf blowing. These "managed" edge plots resulted in leaf-litter depths two to three times that of the natural edge and forest plots.

The researchers then compared the presence of nymphal (juvenile) blacklegged ticks (*Ixodes scapularis*) and lone star ticks (*Amblyomma americanum*) in the test plots the following spring. In both years, the results for lone star tick nymphs were inconsistent, but the number of blacklegged tick nymphs in the managed edge plots was approximately three times that of the natural edge and forest plots.

"While we expected to see more ticks along lawn edges with deeper leaf-litter accumulation, we were surprised about the magnitude of the increase in ticks that resulted from leaf blowing or raking," Jordan says.

Fallen leaves provide blacklegged ticks with suitable habitat via higher humidity and lower temperatures within the leaf litter, as well as protection from exposure over winter. Previous research, meanwhile, has shown that people more commonly encounter ticks on their own properties

than in parks or natural areas. And that, Jordan says, is a major reason why he and Schulze have been evaluating a variety of residential tick-prevention strategies in recent years. Landscape management is an important--and affordable--strategy to keep ticks at bay, he says.

"On properties with considerable leaf fall, the best option would be complete removal of leaves from areas most frequently used--such as lawns, outdoor seating areas, and in and around play sets," Jordan says. "If this is not possible or practical, leaf piles should be placed in areas least frequently used. Where neither of these options is possible, or where leaf fall is minimal, mulching in place may be a good option, since this encourages rapid decomposition of leaves, which may reduce habitat suitability for ticks." (PCT Online, March 20, 2020) <https://www.pctonline.com/article/raking-leaves-ticks/>

## **CALIFORNIA REFUTES US EPA SUPPORT OF BAYER'S GLYPHOSATE CANCER VERDICT**

California's top legal official has weighed in on Bayer's appeal of a federal jury's \$80 million award to a cancer victim, contesting the argument that the plaintiff's claims are pre-empted by federal pesticide law.

The filing by California Attorney General Xavier Becerra takes direct aim at the involvement of the US EPA, which has rallied in defense of Bayer's appeal and called for the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to void the jury's decision.

The case in question involves Edwin Hardeman, a California resident who alleges that exposure to glyphosate herbicide caused him to develop non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. In March 2019, a six-member jury convened by the US District Court for Northern District of California handed down a

unanimous decision in favor of Hardeman, concluding that exposure to glyphosate had played a "substantial factor" in causing his cancer and that Bayer legacy company Monsanto should have warned him of the risk. The jury hit Monsanto with \$75 million in punitive damages as well as \$5.2 million in compensatory damages.

The case, as with thousands of other complaints filed against Monsanto, rests largely on the UN International Agency for Research on Cancer's (IARC) 2015 declaration that glyphosate is a "probable human carcinogen" – a finding that stands in contrast to the views of the EPA as well as regulators in Canada, Europe, New Zealand and other nations.

In its appeal, Bayer says that the complaint is pre-empted by federal law as the EPA has declared that a cancer warning on a glyphosate-based product would constitute misbranding under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Bayer also argues that Judge Chhabria made a series of errors related to expert testimony, effectively tilting the scales against the company and failing to let it fully refute the IARC declaration.

The EPA filed a brief in December backing the company and calling for the jury decision to be overturned.

The FIFRA's pre-emption provision is "sweeping" and trumps Mr. Hardeman's claims under California common law, the EPA said.

"Under FIFRA, the label is the law," according to the Agency. "EPA approved the label for the pesticide/herbicide at issue here, Roundup, through a registration process that did not require a cancer warning. In fact, EPA has never required a labelling warning of a cancer risk posed by Roundup, and such a warning would be inconsistent with the agency's scientific assessments of the carcinogenic potential of the product."

Mr. Becerra's March 23rd filing with the court challenges the EPA's position and argues that

claims under California’s common tort law are not pre-empted by the FIFRA – nor is the state’s listing of glyphosate as a cancer-causing chemical under Proposition 65.

“A requirement under Proposition 65 or state common law that businesses provide a cancer warning for glyphosate-based pesticides is fully consistent with FIFRA’s requirement that a pesticide not be misbranded,” he explained. “If a pesticide contains a chemical that has been determined to cause cancer – in this case, by a jury – then disclosure of that information is ‘necessary . . . to protect public health’ under FIFRA and the failure to do so constitutes misbranding.”

“This is so even if EPA does not agree with the underlying factual determination that glyphosate is a carcinogen, because FIFRA does not give EPA sole authority to determine whether a pesticide is misbranded,” Mr Becerra said, referencing Supreme Court precedent that found the EPA did not have sole authority to enforce the FIFRA’s misbranding provision.

“In short, EPA lacks exclusive authority to determine which pesticides are carcinogenic, or to determine how best to protect public health, an area traditionally within the sphere of state regulation,” Mr. Becerra said. “As a result, so long as a state’s warning requirement is equivalent to FIFRA’s requirement to include information on a label necessary to protect public health and the environment, the state can continue to enforce it regardless of the EPA’s own finding that glyphosate exposures do not pose a cancer risk.”

Arguments for implied pre-emption under the FIFRA also fail, Mr Becerra says, as the EPA’s actions “do not carry the force of law.”

“First, EPA’s approval of a label in registration does not foreclose a claim that the pesticide label is nevertheless inadequate to protect public health and therefore constitutes misbranding,” he told the Court. “Second, a letter EPA sent to pesticide registrants on August 7th 2019, without any opportunity for notice and comment, and that that

did not come out of any formal proceeding, lacks pre-emptive effect.”

The letter in question was sent to all glyphosate registrants, stressing that it does not view the herbicide as a carcinogen and that the addition of a Proposition 65 cancer warning would be illegal under the FIFRA.

Mr. Becerra said the letter “is not formal agency action, and therefore lacks the force of law”.

The fate of the appeal is hugely important to Bayer as Hardeman’s case was the first federal complaint to go to trial – the company is facing some 5,000 additional complaints in federal court as well as thousands in state court. The lawsuits have all been brought by cancer victims who allege that Monsanto had failed to warn of the carcinogenic risks of its glyphosate products.

In addition to the Hardeman case, the company has lost the two other cases that have made it to trial. Bayer has also appealed those two rulings and has successfully postponed pending trials amid growing speculation the company is close to settling the remaining claims for some \$10 billion.

Company executives are also facing a shareholder lawsuit brought by an investor who alleges that the deal to buy Monsanto was irresponsible and one of the “worst corporate acquisitions in history”. (AGROW, March 30, 2020)

## **RESEARCH COMPARES MICRORATES OF DICAMBA AND 2,4-D**

With the coming of age of different chemistries in the soybean seed market, off-target drift has been an increasing concern for producers employing the new chemistries. Enlist E3 soybeans were available for planting in 2019, but 2020 is the first planting season where these 2,4-D-tolerant soybeans are available to farmers in commercial quantities.

With the acreage of E3 soybeans set to dramatically increase across the soybean belt, there is no doubt that off-target drift will be a continued concern for some farmers on their non-2,4-D-tolerant soybean fields.

A University of Nebraska field study that began in 2019, and will continue through this growing season, is looking at the effect of microrates, or drift rates, of 2,4-D on four soybean types — including dicamba-tolerant, Roundup Ready, LibertyLink and conventional.

Stevan Knezevic, Nebraska Extension weed scientist, recently explained the differences between dicamba and 2,4-D and the microrates of each at a Crop Production Clinic in Norfolk. He explained some of the differences between dicamba and 2,4-D impacts from off-target microrates on nontolerant soybeans.

"We've been using dicamba and 2,4-D for 30-plus years," Knezevic said. "But with the introduction of dicamba- and 2,4-D-tolerant varieties coming to market, we are using those more and more."

### **Study results**

Studying and comparing using both a visual assessment and actual yield differences (see table below) after the application of various microrates that simulate drift in the field, Knezevic talked about some of the early findings.

One-tenth of the labeled rate of dicamba caused 70% to 80% plant damage according to trained visual assessment, he said. The same proportional microrate — one-tenth the labeled rate — caused 15% to 20% visual damage from 2,4-D application. Yields from this same proportional microrate on dicamba ranged from 6 to 30 bushels per acre. The 2,4-D plot yielded 50 to 55 bushels from one-tenth the labeled rate.

The same trend continued as the microrates became more diluted. One-hundredth of the labeled rate produced 50% to 70% visual injury from dicamba,

while the same proportion of the labeled rate of 2,4-D exhibited 0% to 5% visual damage.

On the yield side, this microrate produced 45-50 bushels per acre in yield on the dicamba plot, but 60-65 bushels per acre on the 2,4-D plot. The control plots yielded 65 bushels per acre as well. With a microrate of one-thousandth of the labeled rate, visual damage was 40% to 60% on the dicamba plot, and yields were 55-60 bushels per acre. The same microrate on the 2,4-D plot left no visual damage and yields the same as the control.

### **Looking at differences**

Symptoms of off-target drift and microrates are different for each type of herbicide. "Dicamba boosts the growth in the plants, and that's why you see the curling and twisting of the plants," Knezevic said.

Usually, two days after application, there will be initial leaf cupping in nontolerant plants from dicamba. Glyphosate is different, in that it takes four to seven days to show symptoms, depending on the temperature, and leaves will turn yellow. With 2,4-D, off-target soybean plant damage will consist of what Knezevic calls "bubbly leaves," and will take between seven to 10 days to exhibit those symptoms.

"Volatility is much higher with dicamba," he said. "It is not as much with 2,4-D, and very little with glyphosate." Higher temperatures increase volatility. "Dicamba is also rainfast in four to six hours, while glyphosate is rainfast in about an hour, and rainfast for 2,4-D is varied," he added.

For successful use of any type of herbicide, weed height at the time of application is generally important. "We've been using glyphosate for 20 years, and it still works as long as you don't have resistant weeds," Knezevic said. "However, with dicamba and 2,4-D, bigger weeds will be crippled, but they will curl back and start growing again."

The same goes with application rates. Producers can't cut the application rate with dicamba and 2,4-

D if they expect to get a good kill on weeds. This fact makes sprayer calibration even more important with these herbicides.

Of the different types of soybean seed tested in studies, dicamba-tolerant seemed to be the most tolerant of microrate off-target application, while conventional soybean varieties were the most sensitive, Knezevic said. The study also is testing the effect of microrate applications at different growth stages in the plants.

Learn more by visiting [cropwatch.unl.edu](http://cropwatch.unl.edu) or by emailing Knezevic at [sknezevic2@unl.edu](mailto:sknezevic2@unl.edu). (Southwest FarmPress, March 30, 2020) <https://www.farmprogress.com/crop-protection/research-compares-microrates-dicamba-and-24-d>

## **RATS ON THE RISE IN NEW ORLEANS' STREETS DUE TO COVID-19 PRECAUTIONS**

Precautions put in place to slow the rise of coronavirus cases in New Orleans has inadvertently led to a rat problem for the Louisiana city, CBS News reports. With restaurants closed save for take-out service, far less food waste is being discarded in the city's alleyways, driving the local rodent population out into the open to search for scraps.

To control the population, city crews started putting bait in the gutters and placing rat traps throughout the French Quarter neighborhood, CBS News reports.

In a press conference, Claudi Riegel, Director of the City of New Orleans Mosquito, Termite, and Rodent Control Board, expressed concern about the possible infections the rat infestation could spread to the local homeless population. "There are pathogens in these rodents. Fortunately, we don't see many of the health outcomes. We don't have very many disease cases that are actually related to rodents. But the potential is there," she said.

(PCT Online, March 31, 2020)

<https://www.pctonline.com/article/new-orleans-rodent-increase-covid-19/>

## **FED WATCHDOG EYES DICAMBA**

The inspector general of the EPA is planning to look into whether EPA acted properly when it registered dicamba in 2016 and 2018, as well as review states' use of Section 24(c) labels, often used for dicamba in recent years.

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) functions as an internal government watchdog for all the major federal and state agencies. Each government agency, including EPA, has an OIG division within it that regularly reviews the agency's actions and programs for fraud, waste, abuse or mismanagement.

Once released, OIG reports are public and often require responses and action plans from the federal agency under review.

Each year, the EPA's OIG releases its annual plan for audits, evaluations and investigations. The 2020 plan states that inspectors plan to look into the EPA's past registrations of dicamba herbicides XtendiMax (Bayer), Engenia (BASF) and FeXapan (Corteva) in the second half of 2021.

The purpose of the investigation will be to "determine whether the EPA adheres to federal requirements and scientifically sound principles for the 2016 registration and 2018 renewal for the new uses of the dicamba herbicide," according to the OIG annual plan.

The OIG would not comment on why the division is planning to investigate the registrations of dicamba herbicides, only stating that it has the latitude to

investigate any "FIFRA [Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act] issues of concern," OIG public affairs specialist Kentia Elbaum told DTN in an email.

The investigation would add yet another level of scrutiny to the registrations of dicamba herbicides, which have come under fire since their release in 2017 for widespread claims of off-target injury to sensitive crops from scientists, farmers, environmentalists and rural residents in the Midwest and South. University weed scientists have conducted research showing that the herbicides are capable of volatilizing and moving off-target for hours and even days after application, despite companies marketing the three herbicides as low-volatility formulations.

Bayer and BASF are also facing multiple lawsuits from farmers over crop injury from dicamba, and recently lost one such court case to Bader Farms in southeast Missouri, which both have vowed to appeal. Bayer and EPA are also facing a lawsuit pending in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, wherein farmer and environmental groups argue EPA violated federal laws when registering XtendiMax in 2016 and 2018.

The OIG also reported a future investigation into Section 24(c) Special Local Needs labels, to "determine what controls EPA has in place to verify states and whether the EPA is following procedures and policies for review and approval of Special Local Needs Exemptions for pesticides."

States' use of Section 24(c) labels has come under scrutiny by EPA in the past two years, since many states have turned to them to restrict dicamba herbicides beyond the federal labels.

In March 2019, EPA announced that it was re-evaluating whether or not states would be permitted to use 24(c) in this manner. At issue is the actual language of Section 24(c), which technically only mentions allowing states to grant additional uses of

a federal pesticide. However, EPA has long permitted states to add restrictions to address local needs, such as environmental, crop and worker safety, which it acknowledges in its official guidance on 24(c) labels: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

In its March 2019 announcement, EPA said that it would make any decisions on 24(c) changes public and available for comment, but so far, the agency has not done so.

Although the OIG investigations into dicamba and 24(c) are slated for 2021, inspectors are already doing work to prepare for them, OIG's Elbaum confirmed.

"It is routine to discuss our evaluation and audit topics with knowledgeable stakeholders to ensure that the scope and focus of our work is appropriate," Elbaum said.

Rose Kachadoorian, who serves as program manager for the Oregon Department of Agriculture's Pesticide Program, is one such stakeholder. Oregon is one of the states with the highest number of Section 24(c) labels in the country -- about 240 -- largely because the state produces so many minor crops, such as micro-seed crops, which often aren't represented on federal pesticide labels, explained Kachadoorian.

This expertise earned her a call from OIG inspectors in late February, and they inquired about how Section 24(c) labels work and how her state has used them in the past.

Kachadoorian said she gave the inspectors background on 24(c), but also stressed her state's need for the longstanding practice of issuing 24(c) labels that add restrictions, as well as uses, to federal labels.

"This was something that has happened for decades," she told DTN. "The first time we heard there were any problems associated with it was when states started trying to protect non-target crops, endangered plants species and riparian areas from dicamba volatilization and drift with 24(c) labels. Then, suddenly, it becomes problematic for EPA, which was really puzzling to the states because it had been such a long-term practice."

Read more about states' efforts to preserve this use of 24(c) here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

You can see OIG's annual report for 2020 here: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

(Progressive Farmer, March 12, 2020)  
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/03/12/inspector-general-open-dicamba-24c>

## CEU Meetings

None Available

## ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

Online Pest Control Courses

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

PestED.com

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

Certified Training Institute

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

WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM

<https://pep.wsu.edu/rct/recertonline/>

CEU University

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

Technical Learning College

<http://www.abctlc.com/>

All Star Pro Training

[www.allstarce.com](http://www.allstarce.com)

Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

[www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm](http://www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm)

CTN Educational Services Inc

[http://ctnedu.com/oklahoma\\_applicator\\_enroll.html](http://ctnedu.com/oklahoma_applicator_enroll.html)

Pest Network

<http://www.pestnetwork.com/>

Univar USA

<http://www.pestweb.com/>

AG CEU Online

<https://agceuonline.com/courses/state/37>

For more information and an updated list of CEU meetings, click on this link:

<http://www.kellysolutions.com/OK/applicators/courses/searchCourseTitle.asp>

## NEW ODAFF Test Information

**Testing at PSI test centers has been postponed. With information changing often please consult the PSI test center for available dates once testing becomes available again.**

<http://www.psiexams.com/>

or <http://pested.okstate.edu/html/new-odaff-testing-procedure> (OSU PSEP)

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

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

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

PSI locations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Find us on Twitter at  
@OkstatePestEd**

**Pesticide Safety  
Education Program**