OKLAHOMA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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

December, 2020 CHEM

RECERTIFICATION AND BUSINESS LICENSES RENEWALS

In this final month of 2020 applicators in categories (4) Seed Treatment, (5) Aquatic, and (7c) Fumigation must recertify before December 31 by CEUs or retest at a PSI test center. If recertifying by CEUs applicators need to pay ODAFF the $50 recertification fee to finalize their recertification.

Pesticides business licenses should also be renewed by December 31, 2020. Renewal notifications have been sent out by ODAFF. Commercial licenses are $100 per category and non-commercial licenses are $50 per category.

Remember to update all applicators listed under the business license.

Fees for licenses not renewed by December 31, 2020 will double when renewed in 2021.

For more information go to ODAFF webpage at http://www.oda.state.ok.us/cps/index.htm

(OSU PSEP)

EPA RELEASES DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION FOR GLYPHOSATE

EPA is taking the next step in its regulatory review of glyphosate, the most widely used herbicide in the United States, which is used to control a variety of grasses and broadleaf weeds. Glyphosate is used on about 298 million acres of agricultural crop land every year and is effective and affordable.

Building on EPA's January 2020 action finalizing new mitigation measures for glyphosate, today, EPA is releasing its draft biological evaluation (BE) for glyphosate for public review and comment. Biological evaluations are the beginning of EPA's Endangered Species Act consultation review process for pesticides where the agency determines whether the pesticide "may affect" one or more individuals of a listed species and their designated critical habitats.

EPA followed its March 2020 Revised Method for National Level Listed Species Biological Evaluations of Conventional Pesticides to conduct this biological evaluation. As such, EPA used the best-available science, including advanced exposure modeling techniques to estimate exposures to plants in various environments, such as wetlands.

EPA's draft biological evaluation for glyphosate includes an effects determination for listed species and designated critical habitats and finds that glyphosate is likely to adversely affect a significant percent of endangered species and critical habitats. In order to make its "likely to adversely affect" determination, EPA evaluates whether an individual of a listed species is "reasonably expected" to be exposed to the pesticide at a sufficient level that it will have an effect, and whether that effect will be adverse. The agency will accept public comments on its draft evaluation for 60 days following its release and then will finalize the evaluation.

If EPA determines glyphosate may affect a listed species or its critical habitat, the agency will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (the Services) as appropriate. The Services use the information in EPA's final biological evaluation to develop their biological opinion to determine if the pesticide jeopardizes the continued existence of the species and whether there is adverse modification to its critical habitat. If jeopardy or adverse modification is determined, the Services, with input from EPA, will propose protection measures. Protection measures could include seeking to change the terms of the pesticide registration to establish either generic or geographically specific pesticide use limitations if the agency determines that limitations are necessary to ensure that legal use of a pesticide will not harm listed species or their critical habitat.

To read the biological evaluation, please visit our webpage. EPA is accepting public comments upon publication via docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0585 at www.regulations.gov.
(EPA November 25, 2020)
https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-draft-biological-evaluation-glyphosate

EPA RELEASES DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS FOR ATRAZINE, SIMAZINE AND PROPAZINE

EPA is taking the next step in its regulatory review of atrazine, simazine and propazine, three widely-used herbicides used to control a variety of grasses and broadleaf weeds. Atrazine is used on about 75 million acres of agricultural crop land every year and is especially effective, affordable, and well-studied.

In September 2020, EPA announced its interim registration review decisions for atrazine, simazine and propazine (collectively known as the triazines), finalizing measures to protect human health, mitigate potential ecological risks while providing America's farmers with valuable tools they have come to rely upon.

Today, EPA is releasing its draft biological evaluations (BEs) for triazines for public review and comment. Biological evaluations are the beginning of EPA's Endangered Species Act consultation review process for pesticides where the agency determines if an endangered or threatened species or critical habitat could be affected by the use of a certain pesticide.

EPA will accept public comments on the draft evaluations until Jan. 5, 2021. After carefully considering the public comments received and any additional data received, the agency will finalize the BEs. If EPA determines a pesticide may affect a listed species or its critical habitat, the agency will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (the Services) as appropriate. The Services will then issue a biological opinion to determine if the population of a species would be adversely impacted and, if so, propose ways to reduce risks. It is the goal of EPA to ensure that pesticides can continue to be used safely with minimal impacts to threatened and endangered species.

This is the second group of pesticides, and the first herbicides, where the agency used its March 2020 *Revised Method for National Level Listed Species Biological Evaluations of Conventional Pesticides* to assess potential impacts that these herbicides may have on threatened and endangered species and their critical habitats. As such, EPA used advanced exposure modeling techniques to estimate exposures to plants in various environments such as wetlands.

The biological evaluations make effects determinations for 1,795 listed species and 792 designated critical habitats when these pesticides are used according to product labels. This includes no effect (NE), not likely to adversely affect (NLAA), and likely to adversely affect (LAA) determinations. A summary of LAA determinations for atrazine, simazine, and propazine is below:

- Atrazine is likely to adversely affect 54 percent of all species and 40 percent of critical habitats ;
- Propazine is likely to adversely affect 4 percent of all species and 2 percent of critical habitats; and,
- Simazine is likely to adversely affect approximately 53 percent of species and 40 percent of critical habitats.

To read the biological evaluations, please visit our webpage. EPA is accepting public comments via docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0514 at www.regulations.gov.

(EPA November 5, 2020)
https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-draft-biological-evaluations-atrazine-simazine-and-propazine

EPA PROPOSES UPDATES TO LIST OF PESTS OF SIGNIFICANT HEALTH IMPORTANCE

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has released an updated list of pests of significant health importance for public review and comment.

Federal law requires EPA, in coordination with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), to identify pests of significant public health importance and in coordination with the Public Health Service, to develop and implement programs to improve and facilitate the safe and necessary use of chemical, biological, and other methods to combat and control such pests of public health importance. The list serves as a useful tool for private and public organizations including local or state governments, departments of public health, pesticide registrants, and non-governmental organizations when making decisions and plans about future public health actions.

Since this list's original publication in 2002, new vector-borne diseases have been identified and pests

that had been previously thought of as benign or nuisance pests have been found to adversely impact public health. EPA, CDC and USDA collaborated to update the list to incorporate significant changes regarding vector-borne diseases and related research, and eliminate gaps or ambiguities in the current pests list.

The draft Pesticide Registration Notice more precisely describes both the pests and expected public health impacts and adds several new pests (ex. brown dog tick) and public health impacts (ex. Zika fever and coronaviruses like SARS-CoV-2). Other pests have been renamed or grouped with similar species or removed altogether (ex. hobo spider).

The list does not affect the regulatory status of any registration or application for registration of any pesticide product.

EPA will take public comment on the draft Pesticide Registration Notice during a 60-day public comment period ending on January 3, 2021 via www.regulations.gov (Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0260). (EPA November 3, 2020) https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-proposes-updates-list-pests-significant-health-importance

STUDY UNCOVERS WHAT HOMEOWNERS KNOW (AND DON'T KNOW) ABOUT IPM

A **recent study published in the open-access Journal of Integrated Pest Management** explores what residents do and do not know in terms of pesticide use and integrated pest management.

As you might expect, there is a wide range of resident knowledge and adoption of new IPM behavior. Over 2,100 people were surveyed, and the key findings included:

• Most respondents were at least "Fairly knowledgeable" about landscape integrated pest management practices, but between 21 and 26 percent had "Almost no knowledge" of these practices;

• Over 55 percent of respondents "Always" or "Most of the time" managed pests in their yard with as few chemicals as possible;

• Nearly 25 percent of respondents "Always" or "Most of the time" treat their entire yard with pesticides without identifying pests.

For Entomology Today, David Coyle, Ph.D., spoke with the study's lead author, John Diaz, Ph.D., assistant professor and extension specialist at the University of Florida's Department of Agricultural Education and Communication about what this study means.

Click here to read this interview.

(PCT Online November 11, 2020) https://www.pctonline.com/article/homeowner-ipm-study/

ENLIST DUO SURVIVES APPEAL

Enlist Duo's registration has survived another legal challenge, after the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit declined to reevaluate part of its earlier ruling upholding the herbicide's registration.

In that first ruling in July 2020, a panel of three Ninth Circuit judges ruled in a 2-1 judgement that the herbicide, a 2,4-D-choline-glyphosate premix designed to be sprayed over top 2,4-D-tolerant Enlist crops, did not violate federal law, as a group of environmental and farmer groups had alleged in a lawsuit. The judges did order EPA to reevaluate Enlist Duo's impacts on monarch butterflies but left the herbicide's registration intact and on the market.

That ruling was a major victory for the agrichemical industry, which was still reeling from a Ninth Circuit Court decision earlier in the summer, which vacated three dicamba registrations, based on similar legal arguments by the same group of plaintiffs. (See more details here: https://www.dtnpf.com/….)

Specifically, the plaintiffs in the Enlist Duo case -- a group of environmental organizations led by the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Center for Food Safety -- then filed a petition in late September asking for a larger panel of Ninth Circuit judges to rehear part of their lawsuit, known as a "petition for rehearing en banc."

The plaintiffs argued that the original July ruling violated the Endangered Species Act, ignored legal precedent and created "a dangerous loophole" for future pesticide registrations.

On Nov. 18, the Ninth Circuit rejected those arguments. Only one judge -- Judge Paul Watford, who also dissented in the original 2-1 decision -- recommended that the court reexamine the case. As a result, the petition was rejected and the plaintiffs now have only one final recourse, an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The decision comes as Corteva Agriscience, the current registrant of Enlist Duo, is gearing up to oversee the planting of a record number of its 2,4-D-tolerant Enlist crops in 2021.

"All Corteva seed brands plus 100 licensees are adding Enlist traits into their best germplasm, and for 2021, we expect to see more varieties with the E3 trait," Steve Snyder, Enlist technology specialist for Corteva, said in a recent company media event. He added later that, "Last year we were around 20% [soybean market share]. We expect that to grow; we are seeing significant growth for 2021."

In an emailed statement to DTN, the company applauded the Ninth Circuit's decision. "Corteva Agriscience is pleased with this decision that affirms the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2017 registration of Enlist Duo herbicide," the statement read. "We are confident in the sustainability and effectiveness of Enlist Duo herbicide."

(Progressive Farmer, November 19, 2020)
https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/11/19/ninth-circuit-rejects-request-rehear

PESTICIDE RESIDUE COMPLIANCE AT 97% IN US

Some 96.8% of domestic food samples tested by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in fiscal 2018 (ended September 30th) complied with pesticide tolerances, according to its latest **report**. That compares with a compliance rate of 96.2% in **fiscal 2017** and 99.1% in fiscal 2016.

No pesticide residues were found in 47.1% of the 1,448 domestic food samples tested. Illegal residues were detected in 3.2% of the samples and this level is consistent with the violation rate range of 0.9-3.8% seen over 2012-17, the FDA says. The vegetables commodity group had the highest rate of violations, at 5.8%. Among the 47 illegal samples of domestic food, 39 contained residues for which no tolerance was established and 14 exceeded tolerance limits.

The FDA tested 2,956 samples of imported food, of which 87.1% were compliant. No pesticide residues were found in 47.2% of the import samples. The percentage containing Illegal residues, at 12.9%, was slightly higher than the range of 9.4-12.6% recorded over 2012-17. The increase is partly due to the higher violation rate on cilantro (44.9%) and radishes (34.5%) that were targeted for increased sampling based on past results, the FDA says. Within the cereals group, rice accounted for 89.9% of the violations. Among the 382 illegal imported samples, 364 were “no tolerance” violations and 59 had residues above tolerance limits.

The FDA found 212 of the 809 pesticides and industrial chemicals that could have been detected

during residue monitoring. The most frequently detected pesticide was the insecticide, imidacloprid, followed by the fungicides, boscalid, azoxystrobin and pyraclostrobin, and the insecticide, chlorpyrifos.

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, November 20, 2020)

EPA, STATES CLASH OVER PESTICIDES

State regulators are reeling from a sudden apparent policy change by EPA that will make restricting pesticides -- such as dicamba -- beyond the federal label much harder for states to accomplish in the years ahead.

The policy change was announced in a single footnote, buried amid dozens of pages of regulatory documents accompanying EPA's three new dicamba registrations released on Oct. 30. The footnote is only three sentences long, but it packs a punch, regulators and legal experts said. It will require states to go through state law or rulemaking processes if they want to further restrict a federal pesticide, like dicamba.

That means in 2021, most states may be limited to the federal dicamba labels, and unable to implement local dicamba cutoffs and restrictions before the spray season. Only Arkansas's cutoff date of May 25, which has gone through a state rulemaking process each year, is likely to remain in place.

That footnote also reverses decades of precedent, breaks EPA's past promises to the states and threatens to damage the longstanding cooperative relationship between federal and state regulators.

At issue is Section 24(a) and 24(c) of the Federal, Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), EPA's governing law. Section 24(a) establishes that states have the right to regulate federal pesticides through state legislatures or rulemaking procedures, a time-consuming and often political process that can take years.

Section 24(c) is more nimble. It grants states the right to issue "special local needs labels" on an annual basis, to address local agricultural, environmental or public health needs by granting "additional uses" to federal pesticide labels.

For nearly three decades, EPA has interpreted Section 24(c) as also permitting states to "impose more restrictive measures" to federal labels. In 1996, the agency formalized this interpretation and published it as a guidance for states; it still stands on the agency's website here: https://www.epa.gov/…. Restrictive 24(c) state labels became particularly popular starting in 2017, as states used special local needs labels to further restrict dicamba pesticides in an effort to control widespread off-target injury reports from the herbicides.

THE FIRST STIRRINGS OF CHANGE

In the spring of 2019, in the midst of yet another wave of state-by-state restrictions to EPA's federal dicamba labels, the agency issued a warning to the states that it was "re-evaluating" this practice and might not allow it to continue, because it violated the actual language of Section 24(c).

See more here: https://www.dtnpf.com/…

State regulators rushed to defend the practice, and pesticide officials from 10 states across the country wrote to EPA urging them not to change this policy. So did the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA) and the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO).

Rick Keigwin, then director of the EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs, reassured the states that no changes would be made to the agency's 24(c) interpretation without their input.

"Before adopting any changes in this regard, we will solicit public comment on our proposed new approaches," Keigwin wrote to both AAPCO and Alabama state regulators in letters sent in the spring and summer of 2019. "We look forward to a robust public dialogue with our stakeholders, partners and co-regulators on this matter."

EPA DROPS ITS DECISION -- SORT OF

That "robust public dialogue" never happened, state regulators told DTN.

"There was no public comment period, no consultation," said Leo Reed, an Indiana pesticide regulator and president of AAPCO.

Instead, on page 20 of an EPA document supporting the new 2020 dicamba registrations, EPA included a single footnote, stating that:

"FIFRA section 24(a) allows a state to regulate pesticides more restrictively than EPA under the state's own authority. However, some of the states that have imposed cut-off dates on dicamba uses have done so under section 24(c). Section 24(c) only authorizes states to issue registrations for additional uses of federal registrations to meet special local needs; if states wish to impose further restrictions on the dicamba products, or any other federally registered pesticides, they should do so under section 24(a) of FIFRA."

In an emailed response to DTN, EPA confirmed that this footnote represents an official change to its policy for all pesticides, stating that: "EPA has determined that moving forward, EPA may disapprove any state registrations under FIFRA section 24(c) that further restrict use of pesticides registered by EPA, regardless of the chemicals involved. If a state wishes to further restrict use of a pesticide, they must do so under section 24(a) of FIFRA."

The agency said the previously promised public comment period was "not appropriate as section 24(c) is being properly interpreted as written."

However, for now, the agency's guidance to Section 24(c), which permits additional state restrictions, still stands on its website.

The result is that state officials remain in a confusing legal limbo, said Brook Duer, a staff attorney at Penn State's Center for Agricultural and Shale Law.

While EPA's stance might be supported by the language of the law, the longstanding, published interpretation permitting 24(c) restrictions represents what's known as a "binding norm" under federal administrative law, he said. "So unilaterally reversing it through a footnote, without a more transparent and public process -- like what EPA previously represented would be undertaken -- is certainly unorthodox and may even create the basis for litigation to prevent the reversal," Duer said.

"This is still totally up in the air," he added. "There's no guidance on what happens to restrictive 24(c) labels that are in effect right now -- is this a blanket invalidation of them all?"

In its press release announcing the new dicamba registrations and noting this change to 24(c), EPA linked to a very specific portion of its 24(c) guidance, a section that prohibits states from issuing labels that would "negate or void" federal label restrictions. That suggests this might be how the agency intends to implement this sudden policy change without any public deliberation, Duer said. But that portion of the guidance is immediately followed by sections of equal weight that specifically permit restrictive state 24(c) measures, he added.

"So they are cherry-picking their own previous guidance to fit the argument they suddenly want to make now," he said. "If that sounds shifty, it's because it is."

"This is not how a federal agency should be conducting itself," he added. "Doing [this] as a footnote and slipped into a press release does not engender a positive relationship with the states who are a significant portion of the 'boots on the ground' in pesticide regulation for the benefit of all."

STATE REGULATORS REACT

State pesticide regulators told DTN the move by EPA was surprising and demoralizing.

"That was disappointing," said Rose Kachadoorian, a pesticide regulator from Oregon, a state with dozens of 24(c) registrations in place. "We are co-regulators with EPA, and we believe we have a good relationship with EPA. But this doesn't feel like a co-regulator relationship. A change in the agency's interpretation of a law should go through a

public process, especially when it deviates from a longstanding practice that EPA has said was fine in [its written guidance]."

States do still have the authority from Section 24(a) to create more restrictions on federally registered pesticides, AAPCO's Reed said. But he worries that forcing states to create entirely new state rules or laws regarding a pesticide limits their ability to react quickly to new pesticides or new environmental conditions or concerns.

The new federal dicamba labels, for example, list specific cutoff dates: June 30 in soybeans and July 30 in cotton. Those dates aren't necessarily best for every cotton- and soybean-producing state, which range widely in geography, climate and landscape, noted Josh Stamper, a Minnesota pesticide regulator. His state has enacted a June 20-cutoff date for the past three years for dicamba use.

"Every year, we've worked with commodity groups, registrants and universities to evaluate, do we need any last-minute changes? Should we extend the cutoff date?" he explained. "The challenge with using rulemaking instead of 24(c) is that it doesn't give you the ability to respond to changing rules, changing needs or changing weather."

State rulemaking processes can vary, but for many states, proposing, drafting, accepting public comment on new regulations and working through legislatures to enact them can take at least two years, added AAPCO's Reed.

"And in the meantime, your flexibility is gone," he noted. "Once that regulation is in place, if you need to tighten it or change it, that's another two-year process."

Kachadoorian said regulators are also frustrated that it appears EPA is altering its stance on 24(c) to address a single pesticide, dicamba, potentially at the expense of countless other pesticides that require state-specific restrictive 24(c) labels.

"This was never a problem until the dicamba situation," she said.

The policy change could force some states not to register federally registered pesticides if they have any local ecological or public health concerns, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation told DTN in an email.

"In the past, New York State may have used the 24(c) special local needs process to register these [kinds of] products with New York State-specific restrictions," the agency statement said. "Without the option to use more restrictive 24(c) special local need registrations, these pesticides will likely not be approved for registration, making them unavailable for use in the state."

EPA ending states' ability to add their own restrictions to federal dicamba labels is especially frustrating, given that state regulators -- who are responsible for implementing and enforcing federal labels -- had no input in their development, Reed said. As a result, many concerns state regulators have raised about the language, complexity and enforceability of dicamba herbicide labels were left unaddressed once again, he said.

"These dicamba registrations were negotiated solely between the registrants and the EPA," he said. "AAPCO and its committees did offer to review any specific label language for clarity and enforceability; we made that offer to both the agency and the registrants. That hasn't happened."

LOOKING AHEAD

Going forward, states may find it hard to challenge EPA's new stance on 24(c) in court, despite the long-standing precedent it ends, in part because the move was so unusual, Duer added.

"I think it will be hard to get very clear, precedent-setting cases that will help states try to stick up for their ability to continue to use restrictive 24(c)'s," he said.

Nor are they likely to have the resources to devote to that, especially with state regulators staring down another season of dicamba use, which has eaten up large amounts of state pesticide regulators' budgets and time in past years. In Indiana, for example, the Indiana Office of State Chemist estimates 35% of the state's entire pesticide enforcement budget went to policing dicamba use in 2020, as well as 30% in 2019 and 60% in 2018.

"I don't know if states will be the ones to spend their limited resources in court over this particular issue," Duer said. "They are in a real bind."

(Progressive Farmer, November 6, 2020)
https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/11/06/epa-throws-roadblock-state-dicamba

USDA TRACKING DEVICE HELPS LOCATE ASIAN GIANT HORNET NEST

After weeks of searching, Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) entomologists––using a radio tag provided by USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and a trap developed by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service—— have located and eradicated the first Asian giant hornet (AGH) nest ever found in the United States. For months, WSDA had been trying to find the nest they knew must exist near Blaine, WA, because of AGH detections in the area. But finding the nest proved extremely challenging since the hornets build nests in forested areas, typically in an underground cavity.

WSDA was racing the clock. In the late summer and early fall, Asian giant hornets can attack honey bee hives. The hornets kill all the adult bees, leaving them at the bottom of the hive. The hornets then take the hive's bee larvae and pupae back to their nest to feed their own brood. And there's another threat: A large and healthy nest could produce mated queens, which could create new nests in the following spring.

WSDA entomologists had a plan: Capture a live hornet, attach a radio tag to it, release it, and track the radio tag back to its nest. But they faced many hurdles: Once they captured a live hornet, they first needed to find a way to attach the radio tag securely without harming the hornet. They also needed a strong enough signal to track the tag, adequate battery life for the operation and the ability to move through rough terrain with the tracking equipment.

That's where USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) came in.

APHIS' Otis Pest Survey, Detection & Exclusion Laboratory in Massachusetts had developed expertise in using radio tags on insects. "For two years, APHIS scientists have been attaching radio tags to the spotted lanternfly to study their movements," said APHIS Entomologist Miriam Cooperband. "These invasive insects have been found in several East Coast states and can attack many tree species and crops. The tags worked well for us, and we were happy to offer them to our Washington state colleagues, along with the antenna, receiver and tutorials."

Using a radio tag from APHIS, WSDA entomologists tracked the signal to a dead tree but they didn't see evidence of a ground nest. Then a few buzzing hornets got the attention of WSDA Managing Entomologist Sven-Erik Spichiger. He looked up and saw AGHs entering and leaving a crevice about 8 feet up in the tree. Nest found! Two days later, Spichiger and his team with a representative from APHIS plugged the nest with foam, wrapped the tree in plastic, and vacuumed out the hornets. To complete the eradication, they injected carbon dioxide into the tree to kill any remaining AGH.

In a recent press conference, Spichiger noted that, given the radio tag's strength, "I'm pretty confident as long as we can get live hornets, we can follow them back, and that really gives us a great tool in an overall eradication program."

Now that they've shown that it's possible to find and eradicate a nest, the hunt continues for any other AGH nests that might be in the area.

(PCT Online November 11, 2020)
https://www.pctonline.com/article/wsda-usda-asian-giant-hornet-tracking-device/

CEU Meetings

Please note that many of these meetings are now being done virtual. Please contact the meeting host directly if you have any questions.

Date: December 3, 2020
Title: Rolling Plains Applicator Training
Location: Virtual
Contact: David Graf (940) 716-8610

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	1A
2	6
1	8
1	11A

Date: December 3, 2020
Title: OARA CEU Session 1
Location: Virtual
Contact: Tammy Ford-Miller (580) 233-9516
https://www.oklahomaag.com/

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	1A
1	7C
2	10

Date December 4, 2020
Title: ONLA Webinars
Location: Virtual
Contact: Summer Maser (405) 945-6737
https://www.oknla.org/events

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	3A
1	3C
1	10

Date: December 10, 2020
Title: OARA CEU Session 2
Location: Virtual
Contact: Tammy Ford-Miller (580) 233-9516
https://www.oklahomaag.com/

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	1A

Date: December 8, 2020
Title: Target Specialty Oklahoma Fall Webinar 2020 Day 1
Location: Virtual
Contact: Jennifer Gonzalez (800) 352-3870

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	7A
2	10

Date: December 9, 2020
Title: Target Specialty Oklahoma Fall Webinar 2020 Day 2
Location: Virtual
Contact: Jennifer Gonzalez (800) 352-3870

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	3A
1	3B
1	6
1	7A
1	7B
1	8
2	10
1	13

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/

Veseris
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

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 **855-579-4643**

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