

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



August, 2020

CHEM

- 1 FUMIGATION WORKSHOPS SCHEDULED FOR AUGUST
- 2 EPA HOLDS VIRTUAL TRAINING FOR PESTICIDE APPLICATORS IN INDIAN COUNTRY
- 2 EPA RELEASES TEMPORARY GUIDANCE REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS DURING COVID-19
- 3 EPA APPROVES 13 PRODUCTS FROM LIST N AS EFFECTIVE AGAINST SARS-COV-2
- 4 SHUTDOWN OF MARIJUANA PROCESSOR SOUGHT FOR 'FLAGRANT, CONTINUOUS AND WILLFUL VIOLATIONS' OF REGULATIONS
- 5 ENLIST DUO RULING
- 6 NC STATE STUDY: 'BUG BOMBS' ARE INEFFECTIVE KILLING ROACHES INDOORS
- 7 PESTICIDE COMPANIES PRESS COURT TO RECONSIDER DICAMBA BAN
- 9 EPA ALLOWS FAST-TRACK REVIEW OF 'GREEN CHEMISTRY'
- 10 WASHINGTON TRAPS FIRST ASIAN GIANT HORNET
- 11 CEU MEETINGS
- 12 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 12 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

FUMIGATION WORKSHOPS SCHEDULED FOR AUGUST

Fumigation workshops have been scheduled for August 25 and a repeat date for August 26. These workshops will allow fumigation applicators to earn CEUs in the 7C category. These classes will be in Stillwater and be conducted by Dr. Carol Jones and Edmond Bonjour.

Please note that the workshops will be held in a new location this year at The Botanic Garden Educational Center at OSU.

To sign up for the workshop please go online at https://secure.touchnet.com/C20271_ustores/web/store_cat.jsp?STOREID=15&CATID=402 For more information please contact Edmond Bonjour at 405-744-8134 (OSU PSEP)

EPA HOLDS VIRTUAL TRAINING FOR PESTICIDE APPLICATORS IN INDIAN COUNTRY

EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs will host a two-day virtual training on Aug. 19-20, 2020, to certify participants as private applicators of restricted-use pesticides (RUPs) in Indian country under the [EPA Plan for the Federal Certification of Applicators of Restricted Use Pesticides within Indian Country \(EPA Plan\)](#).

RUPs require special care to avoid harming human health and the environment. In accordance with the requirements in 40 CFR § 171, RUPs can only be sold to or used by pesticide applicators who are specially certified, or to persons under the direct supervision of a certified applicator. RUPs can only be used in areas where EPA has explicitly approved or implemented an applicator certification plan for that state, tribe or federal agency.

Any person who uses RUPs in an area of Indian country under the [EPA Plan](#) needs a federal certification from EPA. Additionally, some tribes may choose to further restrict or prohibit the use of RUPs in their areas through the implementation of tribal codes, laws, regulations or other applicable requirements. The EPA Plan does not supersede such tribal requirements. Applicators of RUPs in Indian country should take steps to determine if there are additional tribal requirements they must follow.

Applicators interested in attending the two-day, 12-hour course should express interest by providing a full name to EPACertplan@epa.gov by Aug. 11, 2020. Another training is scheduled for Nov. 18-19, 2020.

[Learn more about this training opportunity.](#)

If you are a private or commercial applicator with a current and valid state, tribal or federal certification who wishes to apply RUPs in Indian country, please visit [EPA's website](#) to learn more. (EPA August 3, 2020) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-applicator->

[certification-indian-country/training-private-applicators-under-epa-plan](#)

EPA RELEASES TEMPORARY GUIDANCE REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS DURING COVID-19

EPA has released a temporary guidance regarding the certification of pesticide applicators of restricted use pesticides that offers flexibility during the COVID-19 public health emergency.

The Agency is aware that state, tribal and federal certifying authorities may need to make temporary changes to their existing pesticide applicator certification programs during this time. Given the evolving circumstances and the urgency involved, EPA has determined that certain temporary changes to their programs should be preapproved and may be implemented provided that they are not likely to significantly diminish applicator competence or undermine future certification activities and all conditions are met.

Currently, certifying authorities can make non-substantial changes to their certification plans without prior EPA approval, but need to notify EPA within 90 days or with the required annual report, whichever occurs first.

So long as such temporary changes are reported to EPA as outlined in the guidance, EPA does not intend to impose sanctions on certification programs that miss reporting deadlines specified in the CPA rule. EPA will instead accept notifications included in the annual reporting, which are due December 31, 2020.

EPA is temporarily pre-approving substantial modifications if the modifications meet all the following conditions:

Time-limited to no later than Dec. 31, 2021 and revocable within 90 days or less by the certifying

authority if EPA determines that the modification is no longer appropriate;

- Consistent with pesticide labeling;
 - Consistent with [EPA's Certification of Pesticide Applicators regulation](#);
 - Will not significantly diminish applicator competency; and,
 - Will not undermine future certification activities.
- To read the temporary guidance in full, visit [our webpage](#).

Additional Information

Certifying authorities must still obtain EPA's advance approval of substantial modifications of their certification plans that do not meet all the above conditions. State and tribal certifying authorities should contact their EPA regional office for more information or to request approvals for substantial modifications to be made in response to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

This temporary guidance also includes a modification to the recertification period for certificates issued to certified applicators that apply restricted use pesticides in Indian country under [EPA's Plan for the Federal Certification of Applicators of Restricted Use Pesticides within Indian country](#). Certified applicators holding an EPA-issued certificate based on a currently valid underlying certificate from another jurisdiction (e.g., state-issued) are granted an extension that aligns with the expiration date of the underlying certificate.

This guidance is temporary, and EPA will assess the continued need and scope of this temporary guidance on an ongoing basis. EPA will provide notice [here](#) under "Certifying Pesticide Applicators" at least seven days prior to terminating this guidance.

(EPA July 27, 2020)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-temporary-guidance-regarding-certification-pesticide-applicators-during>

EPA APPROVES 13 PRODUCTS FROM LIST N AS EFFECTIVE AGAINST SARS-COV-2

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced that 13 products on [List N](#), EPA's list of products expected to kill SARS-CoV-2, have completed laboratory testing for use specifically against SARS-CoV-2, the novel coronavirus that causes COVID-19.

"As part of President Trump's all-of-government approach to fighting the spread of COVID-19, EPA is continuing its efforts to approve products that have specifically been tested against SARS-CoV-2," **said EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler**. "Each of these products already appears on the agency's list of approved disinfectants—this additional step provides critical scientific data and information on the tools that the American public are relying on to protect their families."

Before pesticide products can legally make claims that they can kill a particular pathogen such as SARS-CoV-2, the claim must be authorized by EPA based on a review of data. Because novel viruses are typically not immediately available for laboratory testing, EPA established guidance for [Emerging Viral Pathogens](#).

The specific products approved include 12 unique products from the manufacturer Lonza and one additional Lysol product from Reckitt Benckiser. While these products were already on List N, they now carry additional weight against the virus that causes COVID-19 based on testing performed by the manufacturer and confirmed by EPA. The total number of products in this category is now 15.

Additionally, EPA continues to add products to [List N](#) that are expected to kill SARS-CoV-2, based on past efficacy testing. There are 469 approved products currently on List N. Those looking for approved disinfectant products should refer to List N for regular updates.

When using an EPA-registered disinfectant, follow the label directions for safe, effective use. Make sure to follow the contact time, which is the amount of time the surface should be visibly wet.

For more information visit: <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/list-n-disinfectants-use-against-sars-cov-2-covid-19>.

(EPA July 30, 2020)
<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-approves-13-products-list-n-effective-against-sars-cov-2>

SHUTDOWN OF MARIJUANA PROCESSOR SOUGHT FOR 'FLAGRANT, CONTINUOUS AND WILLFUL VIOLATIONS' OF REGULATIONS

Oklahoma's governing body for medical marijuana asked a state judge to revoke a processor's license and assess a \$541,000 fine for alleged violations of regulations over pesticides and sales to unlicensed people.

Oklahoma Medical Marijuana Authority officials allege that Moon Mix LLC, an Edmond-based processor of medical marijuana, utilized batches of marijuana that had tested for "high levels of potentially dangerous pesticides," according to a motion filed with the Oklahoma State Department of Health Office of Administrative Hearings.

"The investigation revealed flagrant, continuous and willful violations that place the public's health and safety at risk, including evidence that (Moon Mix LLC) unlawfully diverted and sold medical marijuana to unlicensed persons," the motion states.

Officials with Moon Mix were unavailable for comment Wednesday.

The motion filed by the OMMA seeks to have the business's license revoked and the business fined in excess of \$500,000.

Moon Mix products in mid-May were the subject of the OMMA's first product recall since medical marijuana was rolled out in Oklahoma.

Patients were advised then that batch number 158, one of several batches listed in the motion, was unsafe. OMMA officials said in May that the batch tested above the threshold levels for a fungicide, myclobutanil, which when heated for smoking with cannabis can create toxic gases, including hydrogen chloride, hydrogen cyanide and nitrogen oxide.

Moon Mix personnel reportedly informed OMMA officials that "Batch 158 contained scrap stockpiles of flower gathered by Moon Mix and could not account for where or which grow licenses the flower processed into Batch 158 came from," according to the motion.

Moon Mix is alleged to have purchased dozens of pounds of marijuana throughout 2020 without the required testing and sold or transferred the material without testing. Subsequent testing of several of the batches allegedly showed substantially high levels of pesticides.

OMMA officials further allege that Moon Mix sold medical marijuana products to unlicensed individuals between late December and April. State officials also allege that Moon Mix personnel bought out-of-state medical marijuana products.

Further alleged in the court motion is that Moon Mix irregularly tested its products and maintained irregular documentation.

OMMA officials filed the motion Friday and requested a hearing. As of Wednesday, a hearing had not been scheduled.

(Tulsa World July, 22 2020)
https://tulsa-world.com/news/shutdown-of-marijuana-processor-sought-for-flagrant-continuous-and-willful-violations-of-regulations/article_bd3fd209-d95f-5439-9a51-aa8ce988cbe7.html

ENLIST DUO RULING

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit today denied a petition to vacate the registration of Corteva Agriscience's Enlist Duo herbicide, a 2,4-D-choline and glyphosate premix designed for use over 2,4-D-tolerant Enlist crops.

The court ruled that EPA only needed to fix one oversight with the Enlist Duo registration regarding the herbicide's risk to monarch butterflies. The herbicide's registration will remain intact in the meantime.

The decision in Enlist's favor will come as a relief to many in the agrichemical industry, which is still reeling from a recent Ninth Circuit court decision vacating three dicamba herbicides, based on a similar lawsuit from many of the same plaintiffs as this Enlist lawsuit. (See latest news on that here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

The legal challenge against Enlist Duo was initiated in 2017 by a large group of environmental groups, including The Center for Biological Diversity, the National Family Farm Coalition, the Center for Food Safety, Beyond Pesticides, Pesticide Action Network and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

With one judge dissenting, the other two judges in the Enlist case dismissed the plaintiffs' arguments that EPA followed the wrong procedures in registering Enlist. They also ruled that EPA had sufficient evidence to support the registration of Enlist Duo and refuted the plaintiffs' arguments that EPA hadn't considered the risks of increased herbicide use or volatility potential from the Enlist Duo registration.

The two-judge majority also ruled that EPA did not need to account for potential synergistic effect of mixing Enlist Duo with glufosinate when they registered the herbicide, a concern the judges called "speculative."

Finally, the majority opinion ruled entirely against the plaintiffs' arguments that the Enlist Duo registration violated the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

"The EPA did what the ESA required it to do: assess risks to determine whether the exposure of protected species and critical habitat to potentially harmful chemicals would have any possible effect," the judges wrote in their majority opinion.

The judges' majority opinion only agreed with the plaintiffs' objections to the Enlist Duo registration on one claim: that the EPA failed to consider potential harm to monarch butterflies from increased 2,4-D use on milkweed in crop fields. They decided to "remand without vacatur," that is, send that issue back to EPA for fixing, but without ending the herbicide's registration. "The panel remanded so that EPA can address the evidence concerning harm to monarch butterflies and whether the registration of Enlist Duo will lead to an unreasonable adverse effect on the environment," the majority opinion read.

The lone dissenting Ninth Circuit judge in the case argued that EPA had violated the ESA by "failing to use the best scientific data to assess whether Enlist Duo will adversely affect threatened or endangered species" and that the Enlist Duo registrations should be vacated.

In an emailed statement to DTN, Corteva Agriscience said the company was "pleased with the Ninth Circuit decision to reject petitioners' attempts to vacate the registration of Enlist Duo herbicide," and assured growers that "this leading weed control product can continue to be sold and used by farmers."

The plaintiffs were disappointed with the majority ruling, said Stephanie Parent, an attorney for the Center for Biological Diversity.

"We're extremely disappointed because this ruling blatantly ignores the fact that the EPA relied on data so faulty it was rejected by the National Academy of Sciences," Parent said in an emailed statement to DTN. "As the dissenting judge pointed out, the research the EPA cites does not even qualify as scientific data. And it ignores well-documented science showing Enlist Duo harms endangered species like Hine's emerald dragonflies and Fender's blue butterflies."

The plaintiffs will fight the decision, added legal director for the Center for Food Safety, George Kimbrell.

"The panel majority's unprecedented decision is contrary to controlling law and established science, and Center for Food Safety is analyzing all legal options, including seeking a full court rehearing," he said in an emailed statement to DTN.

(Progressive Farmer, July 22, 2020)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/07/22/ninth-circuit-court-ruling-upholds>

NC STATE STUDY: ‘BUG BOMBS’ ARE INEFFECTIVE KILLING ROACHES INDOORS

Total release foggers, commonly known as “bug bombs,” are ineffective at removing cockroaches from indoor environments, according to a [new study](#) from North Carolina State University.

Bug-bomb chemicals fail to reach places where cockroaches congregate the most – on the underside of surfaces and inside cabinets, NC State researchers say. Besides leaving behind numerous cockroaches, bug bombs also leave behind nasty toxic residue in the middle of floors and countertops, areas cockroaches generally avoid but which are heavily used by humans and pets.

“There’s been a general assumption that bug bombs work to eliminate cockroaches indoors, but no one had conducted a formal assessment of their efficacy and any exposure risks,” said Zachary DeVries, an NC State postdoctoral researcher and the lead author of the study, published in BMC Public Health. “We’ve done that simultaneously in this study.”

To understand more about the effectiveness of total release foggers, the researchers tested four different commercially available bug bombs with various insecticide active ingredients in five different

apartment complexes with moderate to severe infestations of German cockroaches (*Blattella germanica*), common indoor household pests.

“All the fogger products contained pyrethroids, a class of fast-acting insecticides, and some contained piperonyl butoxide, a chemical that prevents roaches from metabolizing, or breaking down, the insecticide,” said Coby Schal, Blanton J. Whitmire Distinguished Professor of Entomology at NC State and senior author of the paper.

After gauging estimates of cockroach populations in 20 homes, the researchers set off the bug bombs, following the labels’ instructions – and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines on preparing the homes for fogger release – to the letter.

The researchers then monitored cockroach populations two weeks and one month after the bombs were released and found no declines from the pre-intervention estimates.

“The bug-bomb products did absolutely nothing to control cockroach populations in these homes,” DeVries said.

Meanwhile, the researchers treated 10 additional homes with either a commercially available gel bait or a professional-grade gel bait. Gel baits are generally applied in small dabs via syringe, so they can be placed directly in the places where cockroaches hide. In contrast to the bug bombs, these baits were effective, after two and four weeks, in eliminating cockroach populations in the 10 homes.

To further test the effectiveness of bug bombs, the researchers placed both roaches raised in the lab and roaches captured in the homes into greased cages – making them inescapable – and set the cages on the floor and in upper cabinets of the studied homes during the deployment of the bug bombs.

“The lab roaches, which are not hardy, had high mortality, as expected,” DeVries said. “The roaches captured in the homes and then brought back, however, had far lower mortality rates than you would expect from direct exposure to bug bombs,

confirming the ineffectiveness of these products when used for German cockroach control.”

The researchers also examined whether bug bombs increased insecticide exposure risks in the homes. Prior to doing that, however, they swabbed floors and kitchen surfaces and found insecticide residue already present.

“Baseline levels of insecticides in these homes makes sense, because residents with moderate to severe cockroach infestations are likely to use insecticides to attempt to eliminate roaches,” DeVries said. “However, what was most disconcerting was that these swabs were collected from the middle of floors and kitchen surfaces, locations where roaches don’t generally congregate.”

Four to six hours after the bug bombs were deployed, the researchers again swabbed floors, kitchen surfaces, walls and cabinets and found average insecticide residues increased 600 times baseline levels on all horizontal surfaces.

One month later, those surfaces were swabbed again; 34 percent still had higher insecticide residue levels than the baseline.

“Bug bombs are not killing cockroaches; they’re putting pesticides in places where the cockroaches aren’t; they’re not putting pesticides in places where cockroaches are and they’re increasing pesticide levels in the home,” DeVries said. “In a cost-benefit analysis, you’re getting all costs and no benefits.”

“This is of particular concern in low-income communities, where bug bombs are frequently used because professional pest control may be too expensive,” Schal added.

Study co-authors include NC State research technician Richard Santangelo, former NC State graduate student Jonathan Crissman and lab assistant Russell Mick.

Funding for the work came from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Healthy Homes program (grant NCHHU0017-11), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program (grant PE-95450709), the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (Center for Human Health and the Environment, P30ES025128), and NC State’s Blanton J. Whitmire endowment.

(PCT Online, July 22, 2020)

<https://www.pctonline.com/article/nc-state-bug-bomb-study/>

PESTICIDE COMPANIES PRESS COURT TO RECONSIDER DICAMBA BAN

Bayer, BASF and Corteva Agriscience continue to contest a decision by a three-judge panel of the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to vacate the registrations of their dicamba pesticides. They have called for the full appellate court to reconsider the underlying lawsuit challenging the US EPA’s approval of the herbicides.

The three companies each filed a petition this week with the Ninth Circuit asking for an “en banc” review of the case, arguing that the three-judge panel erred when it found that the EPA failed to fully consider the risks of allowing the herbicides to be sprayed on post-emergent dicamba-tolerant cotton and soybeans.

Court order

The Ninth Circuit panel issued its order on June 3rd to vacate the three dicamba registrations – Bayer’s XtendiMax, Corteva’s FeXapan and BASF’s Engenia – siding with environmentalists and farmworker advocates who challenged the EPA’s approval amid concerns about damage from dicamba to millions of acres of non-target crop.

In a scathing decision, the panel concluded that the EPA violated the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as the agency “substantially understated the risks it acknowledged and failed entirely to acknowledge other risks” when it approved use of the pesticides on

genetically modified cotton and soybeans in 34 states.

The court found that the EPA's 2018 revised registrations did little to address concerns about drift and volatility and said that the product labels were "difficult if not impossible to follow even for conscientious users."

The EPA responded to the court by issuing a cancellation order for the three herbicides that permits farmers to use some 4 million gallons (15 million litres) of existing stocks until July 31st. More than 60 million acres (24 ha) of dicamba-treated crops are in the ground and the agency sided with Ag interests who argue that it would be unfair on growers to bar uses this growing season.

The petitioners – led by the Center for Food Safety – asked the Court to block the Agency from allowing any continued over-the-top (OTT) use of dicamba, but the panel rejected that request last month as well as a motion by BASF to recall its June 3rd order.

Timing and precedent

The three registrants have now turned to the full Ninth Circuit in a bid to reverse the order requiring the EPA to vacate the registrations. In its filing with the court, Bayer argues that the June 3rd order has caused "massive disruption to the farming community" and should be reviewed because of jurisdictional issues.

Bayer contends that the petitioners missed the deadline for challenging the registrations, pointing to the provision in federal pesticide law that requires any challenge be filed within 60 days and noting the CFS-led coalition missed that deadline by 11 days.

The panel explained that it accepted the petitioners' filing because of an EPA regulation that details that Agency orders are generally not "entered" for purposes of judicial review until two weeks after they are signed.

Bayer argues that the court, however, ignored the EPA's assertion that the two-week deferral rule

"would not and could not apply to orders issued with immediate effect – like the orders at issue here – because deferral in such instances would create a gap during which fully effective agency orders are not subject to judicial review".

The Court wrongly gave the petitioners a "jurisdictional pass", Bayer says, adding that the ruling conflicts with legal precedent.

Bayer also argues that the panel failed to show the EPA the deference deserved and failed to fully consider the agency's expert judgments, "cherry-picking the record for evidence supporting vacatur – in effect, substituting its judgment for the highly technical scientific evidence for EPA's".

"This aspect of the decision was contrary to foundational principles of administrative law and also departs radically from this Court's and the Supreme Court's precedent," Bayer says. "On both accounts, rehearing is warranted.

BASF and Corteva make similar arguments and contend that they were unfairly dragged into the legal dispute, noting that the original lawsuit specifically challenged only Monsanto's XtendiMax. Both companies claim that they did not know that their dicamba products were at play in the litigation until the court issued its June 3rd order.

The three-judge panel conducted its review without the administrative record for "those separate registrations, applying a novel interpretation of the governing statutes, and distorting the standard of review", BASF says in its petition. "Its decision is wrong, conflicts with this court's and other circuits' precedents, and presents questions of exceptional importance."

Corteva echoed the worry that the panel's ruling could adversely impact future litigation over EPA registrations.

"Left uncorrected, the panel decision will create substantial confusion in future petitions for review of agency action, and particularly in FIFRA cases," Corteva concludes "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Uncertain future

The continued legal wrangling comes as the EPA is considering whether to re-register the three products – the now-vacated registrations were conditional and set to expire in November 2020.

Given the popularity of the dicamba-tolerant crops – largely as an effective alternative to combat weeds that have become resistant to glyphosate – it seems likely that the EPA will find a way to reapprove uses and the Agency is also considering Bayer’s request to approve dicamba-tolerant maize.

But the Agency is facing pressure from state officials and some farmers to further tighten restrictions on OTT uses, particularly temperature cut-offs as volatility and drift risks increase in hotter weather.

In April, the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials said that label revisions approved by the EPA in 2017 and 2018 have been largely ineffective, voicing concern that the agency appears to be “unwilling or unable to recognize and react to the fact that these products have not been adequately labeled to minimise adverse effects from occurring.”

AAPCO has called on the EPA to only issue one-year conditional registrations for the products and to bar OTT post-emergent uses on soybeans, noting that this could “greatly reduce dicamba complaint investigations” and give states the flexibility to impose specific restrictions to meet their specific needs.

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, July 24, 2020)

EPA ALLOWS FAST-TRACK REVIEW OF 'GREEN CHEMISTRY'

Reduced-risk herbicides and greener chemistries are making an important contribution both to weed management and to the protection of human health and the environment, Weed Science Society of America experts say.

Since the 1996 launch of its [Reduced Risk Pesticide Program](#), the U.S. EPA has offered a fast-track review and registration of chemistries that offer lower-risk alternatives to other registered products. The initiative has led to more than three dozen reduced-risk herbicide registrations, including new active ingredients and new uses of already registered weed management tools.

“[Green chemistry](#) is about continuous improvements aimed at reducing risks to human health and the environment,” says Lee Van Wychen, WSSA’s executive director of science policy. “There is an ongoing, industry-wide focus on chemistries that not only improve weed control, but also exhibit a better overall risk profile.”

Herbicides registered under the Reduced Risk Pesticide Program typically exhibit one or more of the following advantages:

- Lower impact on human health and nontarget organisms,
- Lower potential for groundwater contamination,
- Lower amounts of active ingredient required for effective control,
- Compatibility with integrated pest management strategies that reduce the likelihood of resistance, and
- New products that are transforming weed control

Product examples

Below are three examples of products registered under the reduced-risk program that are transforming weed control:

1. **Florpyrauxifen-benzyl** is a new active ingredient registered for the control of weeds in rice and aquatic sites. It is applied at very low rates – up to 153 times lower than other herbicides commonly used in rice crops. When used according to the label recommendations, it has been shown to pose minimal risk to farmers, applicators, animals and nontarget plants. Florpyrauxifen-benzyl has low persistence in soil and water and low toxicity to birds, insects, fish and other

organisms. It is an effective alternative for control of grass, broadleaf and sedge weeds in rice that are resistant to other classes of herbicides. It is also registered for selective aquatic weed control of several major invasive aquatic plants, including hydrilla and water hyacinth.

2. **Imazamox** is a reduced-risk herbicide used for postemergence control of several broadleaf and grassy weeds in soybeans, alfalfa, canola, dry beans and wheat. It also has been approved for aquatic applications. Like florpyrauxifen-benzyl, imazamox is applied at extremely low rates. EPA granted imazamox reduced-risk status because of its safety profile. Toxicological studies show there is a reasonable certainty no harm will result from exposure to residues from the chemical, even if they were to appear in food or in drinking water.
3. **Mesotrione** has been used for years to control weeds in corn, sugarcane, sorghum and other grass crops. Now, though, it has been granted reduced-risk status for use in small acreage crops like cranberries, asparagus, okra, rhubarb, raspberries, blackberries and blueberries, which have few registered herbicides available for weed control. In many cases, mesotrione is used at a much lower rate than the product it is replacing. Many of the mesotrione reduced-risk registrations were requested by the IR-4 Project (IR-4), which facilitates the registration of conventional pesticides and biopesticides used on specialty food crops and nonfood horticulture crops.

“There is no doubt that reduced-risk herbicides are making an impact,” says Jerry Baron, executive director of IR-4. “They are providing new and greener approaches for battling weeds, improving yields and reducing herbicide resistance.”

(Southwest FarmPress, July 16, 2020)
<https://www.farmprogress.com/herbicide/epa-allows-fast-track-review-green-chemistry>

WASHINGTON TRAPS FIRST ASIAN GIANT HORNET

The Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) trapped its first Asian giant hornet this month.

The hornet was found in a WSDA trap set near Birch Bay in Whatcom County. WSDA trappers checked the bottle trap on July 14 and submitted the contents for processing at WSDA’s entomology lab. The hornet was identified during processing on July 29. This was the first hornet to be detected in a trap, rather than found in the environment as the state’s five previous confirmed sightings were.

“This is encouraging because it means we know that the traps work,” Sven Spichiger, managing entomologist for the department said. “But it also means we have work to do.”

WSDA’s next steps are to search for nests using infrared cameras and place additional traps in order to catch live Asian giant hornet specimens. WSDA Pest Program staff will deploy special traps intended to trap hornets but keep them alive. If they catch live hornets, the department will attempt to tag and track them back to their colony. Once located, the agency will eradicate the colony.

WSDA hopes to find and destroy the nest by mid-September before the colony would begin creating new reproducing queens and drones. Until that time, the colony will only contain the queen and worker Asian giant hornets. Destroying the nest before new queens emerge and mate will prevent the spread of this invasive pest.

In addition to the traps that WSDA has set to catch Asian giant hornets, citizen scientist and other cooperators have placed over 1,300 traps. Those interested in trapping can still build and set traps on their own property. Traps require weekly bait replacement and a commitment to mail the trap contents to WSDA if bees or wasps are collected. If a citizen scientist traps a live Asian giant hornet, they should call the WSDA Pest Program hotline at 1-800-443-6684.

Because the number of Asian giant hornet workers increases as a colony develops, residents should be most likely to see an Asian giant hornet in August and September. If you think you have seen one, report it at agr.wa.gov/hornets. Provide as much detail as you can about what you saw and where. Also, include a photo if you can safely obtain one, and if you come across a dead specimen keep it for potential testing.

You can visit WSDA's website at agr.wa.gov/hornets to learn more about Asian giant hornets. You can also submit questions the WSDA Pest Program at hornets@agr.wa.gov or 1-800-443-6684.

(PCT Online, July 31, 2020)
<https://www.pctonline.com/article/washington-traps-first-asian-giant-hornet/>

CEU Meetings

Date: August 25 and repeats on August 26, 2020
 Title: 2020 Oklahoma Fumigation Workshop
 Location: The Botanic Garden Educational Center at OSU Stillwater OK
 Contact: Edmond Bonjour (405) 744-8134
 Online registration

https://secure.touchnet.com/C20271_ustores/web/store_cat.jsp?STOREID=15&CATID=402.

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	7C
3	10

Date: September 17-18, 2020
 Title: 2019 OPMA Fall Conference
 Location: Reed Center Midwest City OK
 Contact: Eileen Imwalle (405) 726-8773

<http://www.ok-pca.com>

CEU's:	Category(s):
TBD	3A
TBD	6
TBD	7A
TBD	7B
TBD	7C
TBD	8
TBD	10
TBD	11A

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

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/>

AG CEU Online

<https://ageuonline.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>

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

Kevin Shelton

405-744-1060 kevin.shelton@okstate.edu

or Charles Luper 405-744-5808

charles.luper@okstate.edu

ODAFF Test Information

Testing dates and locations may be limited due to the Covid-19 emergency.

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/.

Reservation must be made in advance at 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**