

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



January, 2020

CHEM

- 1 EPA TAKES STEPS TO PROVIDE NEEDED CLARITY AND CERTAINTY FOR U.S. AGRICULTURE
- 4 DICAMBA FATIGUE
- 6 US EPA SUPPORTS BAYER IN GLYPHOSATE CANCER VERDICT APPEAL
- 7 PREVENTING COCKROACH AVERSION WITH GEL BAIT ROTATION
- 9 BAYER AGREES TO POSTPONE ROUNDUP TRIALS
- 9 DUSTS: A CRITICAL ROLE IN COCKROACH MANAGEMENT
- 10 US EPA READY TO RENEW ATRAZINE
- 11 CEU MEETINGS
- 12 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 13 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

EPA TAKES STEPS TO PROVIDE NEEDED CLARITY AND CERTAINTY FOR U.S. AGRICULTURE

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing two important actions that will help the agricultural sector protect crops from pests and weeds. Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), EPA is approving the use of 10 pesticide products on hemp in time for the 2020 growing season. Nine of these products are biopesticides and one is a conventional pesticide. EPA is also issuing a proposed interim decision on atrazine — a widely used herbicide. Both actions provide regulatory certainty and clarity on how these tools can be used safely while also helping to ensure a strong and vibrant agricultural market.

“With common-sense actions, we are protecting the health of our nation and ensuring that crops such as corn, sorghum, sugar cane and hemp can be protected against a broad spectrum of weeds and pests,” **said EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler.** “Under the Trump Administration, the EPA is committed to providing much needed certainty to farmers and ranchers across the country who rely on crop protection tools to ensure a global supply of products, while driving economic growth in agricultural communities across America.”

“EPA’s actions today help support American farmers’ efforts to grow hemp just in time for the first growing season,” **said U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue.** “No other President has done more to remove strangling regulations and promote American farmers than President Trump. From repealing WOTUS, to implementing year-round E-15, and ensuring 15 billion gallons of ethanol are in the marketplace next year, this Administration continues to put farmers first.”

The first action EPA is announcing is the approval of ten pesticide applications for use on hemp, just in time to be used during the 2020 growing season. EPA wanted to ensure the agency acted on these applications quickly to give growers certainty for next spraying season in 2020 and to make timely purchasing decisions for next year. These approvals were made possible by the 2018 Farm Bill, which removed hemp-derived products from Schedule I status under the Controlled Substances Act.

While EPA oversees pesticide registrations for hemp under FIFRA, other federal agencies are working to streamline their separate regulatory implementation processes for the newly legalized crop. The 2018 Farm Bill directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to develop a regulatory oversight program for hemp. USDA has since proposed a rule for state-level hemp growing/management plans. In addition, the Food and Drug Administration also plays a role in regulating hemp products when they fall under their regulatory authority. EPA is committed to working with our federal partners and helping hemp growers obtain the tools needed to support and increase commercial production. The step the agency is taking today recognizes that innovation in pesticide use is critical to the success of our strong and vibrant agricultural sector.

“We’ve learned a lot about hemp since the establishment of the pilot programs in 2014, and we’re continuing our progress to ensure hemp is treated just like every other legal commodity,” **said Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (KY).** “By approving several biopesticides for use in hemp cultivation—especially as Kentucky’s hemp farmers prepare for the 2020 growing season—

Administrator Wheeler is helping deliver much-needed tools for our farmers. Hemp producers across the country are looking to Kentucky for our expertise and leadership with this exciting crop, and I’m committed to helping our farmers, processors and manufacturers take full advantage of hemp’s potential.”

“I’m pleased to hear of the EPA’s approval of 10 pesticides for use on industrial hemp. Since the Farm Bill was signed into law last year, Kentucky hemp farmers have been asking for safe and effective crop protection agents that meet the demands of the booming hemp industry,” **said Senator Rand Paul (KY).** “These approvals will allow for the use of 10 different pesticides for the 2020 growing season, which will be of great benefit for Kentucky hemp farmers. We know the value of hemp in Kentucky, and I will continue to fight for and support all efforts to keep this industry moving forward.”

“I applaud the EPA for taking critical steps to move the hemp industry in the right direction,” **said Congressman James Comer (KY-01).** “This action will benefit farmers in the next immediate growing season, and give them the tools necessary to make their crop and operation even better than before. I am pleased to see our regulatory agencies working in a commonsense way to help our hemp growers succeed.”

“NASDA thanks the EPA for taking the first step to provide crop protection for U.S. hemp farmers. Collaboration will be key as we work to provide a full tool box of solutions, including biopesticides, to the emerging hemp industry,” **said National Association of State Departments of Agriculture CEO Dr. Barbara P. Glenn.**

“Today’s announcement by the United States Environmental Protection Agency is a step in the right direction for the nation’s growing hemp industry,” **said Kentucky Agriculture Commissioner Ryan Quarles.** “It is important our growers have new technologies and tools to better help protect their crops and increase their yields. I wish to thank Administrator Andrew Wheeler and

his team for working hard to assist this new and exciting agricultural industry.”

“We are deeply grateful to the EPA for taking critical action to empower U.S. hemp growers by ensuring the development of products that protect crops from weeds and pests,” **said U.S. Hemp Roundtable General Counsel Jonathan Miller.** “Hemp presents an exciting new agricultural commodity, and the EPA’s action will help provide farmers with the tools they need to seize this opportunity.”

The second action EPA is taking today is to propose new, stronger protections to reduce exposure to atrazine — the next step in the registration review process required under FIFRA. Atrazine is a widely used herbicide that controls a variety of grasses and broadleaf weeds. It is well-known and trusted by growers as one of the most effective herbicides. Atrazine is used on about 75 million acres annually and is most often applied to corn, sorghum, and sugarcane. (Note: Atrazine is not one of the ten pesticides approved for hemp.)

As part of this action, the agency is proposing a reduction to the maximum application rate for atrazine used on residential turf, and other updates to the label requirements, including mandatory spray drift control measures. EPA’s proposed decision is based on the 2016 draft ecological risk assessment and the 2018 human health draft risk assessment for atrazine. EPA is also proposing updates to the requirements for propazine and simazine, which are chemically related to atrazine. EPA will be taking comment on the atrazine, propazine and simazine Proposed Interim Decisions for 60 days after publication in the Federal Register. Comments can be made to the following dockets [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0266 \(atrazine\)](https://www.epa.gov/dockets/epa-hq-opp-2013-0266), [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0250 \(propazine\)](https://www.epa.gov/dockets/epa-hq-opp-2013-0250), and [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0251 \(simazine\)](https://www.epa.gov/dockets/epa-hq-opp-2013-0251) once the Federal Register notice publishes online.

“We appreciate the EPA’s proposal to re-register atrazine,” **said Missouri Corn Growers Association CEO and Triazine Network Chair Gary Marshall.** “This product is tremendously important to farmers across the country, especially

for weed control in conservation practices. From citrus to sorghum and corn to Christmas trees, farmers rely on the agency’s use of credible science to regulate the products that allow us to safely grow more with less for a hungry global population.”

“National Sorghum Producers appreciates EPA applying sound science and moving forward with this key step in the reregistration process,” **said National Sorghum Producers Chairman Dan Atkisson.**

“The impact atrazine has in weed control and making no-till production possible is as vital today as it was over 50 years ago when the product was brought to market. For over 25 years Kentucky Corn Growers has worked to bring production stewardship education and assistance to Kentucky’s farmers encouraging the safe use of atrazine. We appreciate the years EPA has spent reviewing and ensuring the safety and effectiveness of atrazine,” **said Kentucky Corn Growers Association Executive Director Laura Knoth.**

In addition to today’s regulatory actions, EPA is continuing to build and enhance its relationship with the agricultural sector through the agency’s Smart Sectors program. Staff and senior leaders, including Region 5 Administrator Cathy Stepp and Region 7 Administrator Jim Gulliford, are meeting today in Lenexa, Kansas with representatives from the renewable fuels industry. The meeting is providing a platform to collaborate with the renewable fuels industry and develop sensible approaches that better protect the environment and public health.

For additional information:

Hemp action: <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-products-registered-use-hemp>

Atrazine action: <https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/atrazine-background-and-updates>

Smart Sectors: www.epa.gov/smartsectors

(EPA December 19,2019)

<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-takes-steps-provide-needed-clarity-and-certainty-us-agriculture-0>

DICAMBA FATIGUE

Three consecutive years of off-target dicamba injury is taking its toll on the agricultural industry.

Leo Reed even has a name for it: dicamba fatigue.

"States recognize that both we and the [EPA], we're all suffering from dicamba fatigue -- staffing shortages and issues and processing a huge number of complaint cases again this year," said Reed, an Indiana state pesticide regulator serving as president-elect of the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO).

"The term dicamba fatigue applies to growers as well," Reed continued. "We're hearing from growers who say, 'I've been hit three years in a row and I'm not going to report anymore. It's not doing any good.'"

Reed's comments came during a two-day annual meeting of state pesticide regulators, State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG), in Arlington, Virginia. There, during a special session on the herbicide, state regulators reported continued problems with off-target dicamba injury, which overwhelmed some state agencies for a third year in a row. And this year, for the first time, several state regulators also reported growing concerns for the health of non-soybean vegetation, especially trees, as well as human health and safety.

THE 2019 SEASON

In a survey conducted by AAPCO, 19 states reported nearly 1,400 cases of alleged dicamba injury in 2019, most of them coming from a group of 10 states with the highest soybean acreage, Reed said. Most of the regulators from these states acknowledged that these numbers are likely far lower than the actual cases of injury.

"We're hearing the same thing as other regulators -- people are just not reporting," said Ryan Williams, an Oklahoma pesticide regulator who represented the EPA Region 6 states of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas at the meeting. "They're tired of reporting and not getting any results."

Illinois led the country in dicamba injury, with regulators actively investigating 724 cases of alleged dicamba injury, a record for the state, noted Brian Verhougstraete, a Michigan pesticide regulator representing Region 5 states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin.

"Illinois regulators mentioned that you would be hard-pressed to find a non-dicamba-tolerant soybean field in some counties that wasn't damaged, because there were whole counties that appeared to be damaged," Verhougstraete said.

Indiana regulators are investigating 178 alleged dicamba injury cases this year, another state record. Investigations of dicamba injury in the past few years have caused a ballooning budget for the Office of the Indiana State Chemist, but produced few clear-cut answers for the state's farmers. Last year, for example, the agency spent \$2.2 million investigating dicamba injury, but was unable to pinpoint the cause of off-target movement in 84% of their investigations.

With the exception of Missouri, most of the states in EPA Region 7 (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska) are all investigating as many or more injury cases than last year, added Tim Creger, Nebraska Department of Agriculture pesticide/fertilizer program manager.

Despite its decline in dicamba injury cases, Missouri pesticide regulators are severely backlogged, Creger noted. The Missouri Department of Agriculture is still reviewing dicamba cases from 2017 and has yet to review 2018 and 2019 cases.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN HEALTH CONCERNS RISE

Several state regulators mentioned growing concern among the public over the effect of off-target dicamba movement on vegetation beyond soybean fields.

"Illinois reported that their [Department of Natural Resource] is noticing a decline in tree health and they're investigating," Verhougstraete said.

In Nebraska, since 2017, regulators have tracked a three-fold increase in registration of herbicide products containing dicamba, not only in agriculture, but for all uses, including landscape and right-of-way maintenance, Creger said. At the same time, state foresters have begun seeing an increase in damage to the state's trees, he said.

"They're seeing widespread tree damage that they suspect is caused by phenoxy herbicides," Creger said. "Over the last four or so years, they believe there has been a significant increase in the decline of tree health."

"We're seeing a lot more specialty crops being damaged, and things like trees," added Tom Gere, with the South Dakota Department of Agriculture. South Dakota State University Extension scientists are currently analyzing samples from injured trees as part of a multi-state study on the long-term effects of herbicide injury on trees, he noted.

Verhougstraete said regulators in his region are fielding concerns about human health as well.

"We've heard from Illinois regulators that they're hearing from farmers' families that they're worried about all this dicamba in the air and all the damage and what is that doing to their health," he said. "So now there are health concerns starting to bubble up."

EXPECTATIONS FOR 2020

EPA announced in March 2019 that it was re-evaluating whether states can use Section 24(c) special local needs labels to add restrictions to

federal pesticide labels, such as dicamba herbicides. (See the DTN story here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

Nonetheless, as they await EPA's proposed changes to this system, states are actively rolling out new 24(c) labels with additional restrictions on dicamba herbicides XtendiMax, FeXapan, Engenia and Tavium. Most recently, Illinois, Indiana and Minnesota set a June 20 cutoff date for 2020, with Illinois also adding an 85-degree-Fahrenheit temperature cutoff.

At the SFIREG meeting, state regulators urged EPA not to take this labeling avenue away from them, which would force states to use more time-consuming processes like rule-making or legislation to adjust pesticide labels as needed.

"Every state has a unique geography and agricultural base," Creger said. "Without access to 24(c) labels to address unique issues in each state, what we have is a cookie-cutter approach to 15 states that may have 15 different problems."

Communication with EPA over dicamba problems hit an all-time low in 2019. Unlike the weekly conference calls and data reporting of 2018, very little regular communication between state regulators and EPA occurred this year, Reed noted. (See the DTN story here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

The federal agency had its first formal contact with states regarding dicamba problems in 2019 on Nov. 26, in an hour-long conference call, Reed noted. The most pressing question that states have for EPA remains unanswered so far, however, he added.

"The No. 1 question we need an answer to is: Does EPA consider plant damage from dicamba usage an 'unreasonable adverse effect?' We need a yes or no."

Until then, regulators are not optimistic that 2020 will bring relief for overworked regulators and state agricultural departments.

"The issue continues and will continue, as long as we have [dicamba] labeling the way it is," Creger concluded.

(See more details on the SFIREG meeting here:
<https://aapco.org/...>)

(Progressive Farmer, December 9, 2019)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2019/12/10/states-report-another-year-dicamba>

US EPA SUPPORTS BAYER IN GLYPHOSATE CANCER VERDICT APPEAL

The US EPA has thrown its support behind Bayer legacy company Monsanto in the glyphosate case, saying that the judgment of the US District Court for the Northern District of California awarding damages against the company should be dismissed.

The US District Court for the Northern District of California erred when it denied Bayer legacy company Monsanto's motion to dismiss a case by a cancer victim accusing the company of failing to warn him about the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate herbicide, says the US EPA in a brief filed with the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Laying out specific reasons for why the court was in error, the EPA says that the judgment of the district court should be reversed and the case should be either dismissed or, in the alternative, remanded.

The case pertains to the conclusion by a jury in March 2019 that Monsanto should have warned California resident Edwin Hardeman that its Roundup herbicide can cause cancer. The jury hit the company with \$75 million in punitive damages as well as \$5.2 million in compensatory damages. The punitive damages were reduced in July from \$75 million to \$20 million by US District Judge Vince Chhabria, who concluded that although Monsanto "deserves to be punished" based on the evidence presented at the trial, the size of the jury's award was "constitutionally impermissible".

Bayer filed its opening brief earlier in December seeking to overturn the \$25 million verdict. The stakes are especially high for the appeal as it is the

first at the federal level involving a challenge to the label for Monsanto's Roundup.

"The label is the law"

In its brief, the EPA says that when regulating pesticides under the US Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), the Agency has long declared that "the label is the law". "Every time EPA reviews and approves the label for a registered pesticide, it is making federal law," it declares. Roundup is registered under FIFRA and its EPA-approved label does not contain a cancer warning. The Agency points out that it is unlawful for manufacturers and sellers to make claims on their labels that differ from what the EPA approves.

The Agency points out that while states can generally restrict the sale or use of pesticides, they cannot impose or continue in effect any requirements for labeling or packaging in addition to or different from those required under the FIFRA. The plaintiff in the case claimed that Monsanto failed a legal duty to make additional statements on the label about alleged cancer risks associated with Monsanto's glyphosate — "cancer risks that EPA has for decades concluded science does not support".

The EPA stresses that it reviewed and approved Monsanto's glyphosate label. Referring to California's decision to add glyphosate to its Proposition 65 (Prop 65) list (of chemicals known to cause cancer) in June 2017, the EPA says that the plaintiff asserted that safety labeling requirements exist under California law in addition to and different from that required, reviewed, and approved by EPA. "Plaintiff is wrong and his lawyers sailed directly into pre-empted territory in how they opted to try this case."

California cannot "dictate federal policy"

In August, in response to California's Proposition 65 listing of glyphosate, the EPA issued a letter to all glyphosate registrants stating that labels for products containing glyphosate cannot include claims that the herbicide causes cancer. "It is irresponsible to require labels on products that are

inaccurate when EPA knows the product does not pose a cancer risk," it stated. "We will not allow California's flawed program to dictate federal policy," said EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler.

In its current brief, the Agency says that following California's Prop 65 listing of glyphosate in 2017, many manufacturers that had been registered to use glyphosate reached out to it for guidance. Some specifically sought the EPA's approval to amend their product labels to satisfy Prop 65 and the Agency did approve a limited number of applications allowing the addition of a Prop 65 glyphosate cancer warning to pesticide labels when requested. "These label-change approvals, however, were erroneous because the proposed edits warned of a cancer risk that, according to EPA's assessment, does not exist," the Agency says. "As a result, such a warning instead constituted prohibited misbranding." That was the reason for it to issue a letter to all registrants in August.

Other cases

In addition to the federal case under appeal, Bayer has lost the two other cases that have made it to trial. In August 2018, a California jury awarded a former school groundskeeper some \$289 million in a similar case. A state judge subsequently reduced the damages to \$78 million, concluding that the punitive damages exceeded constitutional limits. In 2019, a second state jury, also based in California, awarded an elderly couple \$2 billion in damages in May. That was subsequently slashed by a judge to under \$87 million. Bayer has appealed both those rulings.

In September, a coalition of agricultural interests, food producers and pesticide manufacturers urged a federal judge to strike down the state of California's decision to add glyphosate to Prop 65. (AGROW, December 30, 2019)

PREVENTING COCKROACH AVERSION WITH GEL BAIT ROTATION

In an attempt to kill a cockroach population, an aversion to a particular gel bait, where the roaches no longer "take the bait," could result if the same gel bait formulation is used repeatedly over time. In addition to a few other essential tips, rotating active ingredients in a gel bait program, therefore, is the recommendation to prevent such aversion.

"Properly trained pest professionals are vital to the implementation of comprehensive cockroach control," according to the Mallis Handbook of Pest Control. Before implementing a gel bait rotation program for cockroach infestations, therefore, a few tips are recommended.

START WITH THE BASICS.

John Komor, owner of Johnny Bugs in North Port, Fla., explains that any cockroach resistance or aversion issues he has encountered began with the homeowner. "My protocol is to ask the homeowner, 'What did you do before I got here?'" he says. Because over-the-counter pest control products contain some of the same active ingredients (AIs) that PCOs use, Komor says, if he ends up using the same AIs, an aversion problem could result.

Don English, owner, Engineered Pest Solutions in Macon, Ga., has experienced similar situations. "The biggest mistake people [make] is they try to treat [the cockroach problem] themselves" by spraying, he says. Instead, the PCO could have used a gel bait, which in a short amount of time would have eliminated the cockroach problem, he explains.

Additionally, educating customers to focus on sanitation to reduce cockroach food supply is a must.

SEALING ACCESS AREAS.

Especially in multi-unit housing complexes, finding methods to prevent cockroaches from moving from unit to unit is a key to helping reduce infestations. “We also found that if we can get the property managers to seal up their pipe chases, instead of having a 4-inch hole for a 2-inch pipe, it makes a huge difference as well,” says Jim Moyer, service supervisor, A.C.E., Griffin Pest Solutions in Kalamazoo, Mich. Utilizing physical modification and exclusion techniques help prevent cockroaches from entering the site.

REDUCE POPULATION ONSITE.

Aside from conducting a full IPM inspection, “the first thing you want to do is get the population down before you’re going to tackle them,” English says. Inspect the infested site to determine the cockroach harborage areas, and then flush out as many as possible, he says. English recommends a backpack vacuum cleaner for this part of the job, as this tool “is the number one thing you can use; there is no resistance to a vacuum cleaner.” English also recommends using air dusters to flush the cockroaches out of hidden pockets on the site. “You want them to move,” so that killing them with a vacuum is an easier task and a direct impact on reducing the population.

“Emphasis on non-chemical approaches such as sanitation, harborage alteration, and physical removal will produce longer-term results and reduce the need for chemical applications,” says the Mallis Handbook of Pest Control.

Baiting and Rotating. Kevin O’Connor, entomologist, Viking Pest Control in Oakdale, N.Y., says that the “first line of defense” in combating a roach problem “is to kill every roach.” Since that is not always possible, the second line of defense is to rotate gel baits, he explains. At Viking Pest Control, O’Connor recommends changing gel bait products every three to four months.

“I believe in gel baits over any other process to eliminate roaches,” says Moyer, who has been in the pest management industry for almost 20 years. “I remember doing the first roach clean-out with gel baits instead of using liquids and dust in a residential house. The roaches would just run to the gel bait,” he says.

Similarly, David Crenshaw, president and CEO, Crenshaw Pest Control in New Port Richey, Fla., explains that “over years of evolution of the pest control industry, we have changed to where we apply zero liquid insecticide in a kitchen.” Instead, he applies “only bait and the dry flowable powders.” After applying the gel baits, “within about a two-week period you have cut the roach infestation in half,” he says.

English says that gel baits are “the most effective in the long run,” but that “paying attention to the bait’s active ingredient” and then rotating are musts. Additionally, English utilizes glue boards to help monitor the cockroach population, whether reduced or “leveled out.” If the population is remaining constant, “you rotate baits,” he says.

At Griffin Pest Solutions, Moyer’s team rotates baits every six months utilizing a chart based on formulation of the bait’s active ingredient. “We go through the four classes [of pesticides], so it will be two years before we are back to the original [class]; we find it to be effective,” he says.

Ultimately, “rotation between different classes of insecticides has been proposed and practiced by many pest professionals... Often, pest professionals also alternate their use of different bait products with the notion that this approach will not only delay resistance evolution, but also that cockroaches might welcome a new food to their environment,” the Mallis Handbook of Pest Control says..

(PCT Online, December 19, 2019)
<https://www.pctonline.com/article/prevent-cockroach-aversion-gel-bait-rotation/>

BAYER AGREES TO POSTPONE ROUNDUP TRIALS

Bayer AG agreed to postpone two upcoming U.S. trials involving its Roundup weedkiller to allow time for mediation talks on a possible settlement with plaintiffs.

The German agriculture giant agreed to delay two trials that were set to begin in January in California, according to an emailed statement to Bloomberg. Other Roundup trials are still scheduled to begin in the same month, Bayer said.

The competing sides had already pushed back a handful of trials scheduled for this fall amid mediation talks in the U.S. The German company has lost three U.S. trials against plaintiffs who claim that Roundup, its top-selling weedkiller, caused their cancer. Bayer has appealed those verdicts and insists the product is safe. There were 42,700 other U.S. plaintiffs suing the company over the product as of October.

Four other cases are scheduled for trials in January - two in California state court and two in St. Louis city and county courts -- and another three trials are scheduled to start in February or March, according to Tom Claps of Susquehanna Financial Group. "If these other cases don't settle and go to trial, it could signal that a settlement may take more time to negotiate," he said in a note to clients.

A settlement value may be in the \$10 billion to \$12 billion range, according to Bloomberg Intelligence analyst Holly Froum.

The first appeals court ruling will probably come in early 2020, though it shouldn't affect the mediation talks much, Bayer Chief Executive Officer Werner Baumann told investors in October. In that case, a jury awarded a California man \$289 million last year, which was later reduced to \$79 million. News of the judgment wiped \$10 billion off Bayer's market value -- just two months after it completed the \$63 billion takeover of Monsanto, the maker of Roundup.

The two postponed trials include one that had been set to start Jan. 15 in Lake County Superior Court in California and will now be delayed for about six months, Bayer said. The other was to begin Jan. 21 in California Superior Court for Alameda County.

Both cases involved plaintiffs who are under the age of 15, creating a "high-risk trial atmosphere for Bayer," Claps said in the note.

Bayer's shares have plunged about 30% since the Monsanto deal closed. The shares were down 0.5% at 4:09 p.m. Friday in Frankfurt. (Southwest FarmPress, December 6, 2019)

<https://www.farmprogress.com/business/bayer-agrees-postpone-roundup-trials>

DUSTS: A CRITICAL ROLE IN COCKROACH MANAGEMENT

Using and rotating gel baits is a recommended action in fighting cockroach infestations. Utilizing dusts in conjunction with a gel bait rotation program is powerful and critical as dusts are potent, long-lasting and low in toxicity.

TEAMWORK.

Considering that cockroaches are "built for survival" (Mallis Handbook of Pest Control), a recommended course of action is to conquer an infestation using multiple pest control techniques. "I don't think I've had a roach job where I didn't use all the tools in the bag," says Don English, owner, Engineered Pest Solutions in Macon, Ga.

Kevin O'Connor, entomologist, Viking Pest Control in Oakdale, N.Y., uses dust "in conjunction" with baits to effectively treat wall voids and harborage areas. Especially commercially, "we would want to eliminate the wall voids as possible areas of harborage, so we'll dust that anywhere from three months to once a year," he says.

David Crenshaw, president and CEO, Crenshaw Pest Control in New Port Richey, Fla., also utilizes a combination of gel baits and dusts. His technicians are instructed not to use dusts around dishwashers or refrigerators where electric motors will “kick on and kick out the dust” and are better suited for gel baits. Instead, the team uses dust products in “pre-formed cavities and gaps” around cabinets that are “harbored spots for roaches,” he says.

“Some sheltering areas might require treatment with a residual dust insecticide prior to sealing,” says the Mallis Handbook of Pest Control. “Often, pest professionals place a dust into the void... dust, and seal the void with caulking, steel wool, or other materials.”

STRENGTH.

Jim Moyer, service supervisor, A.C.E., Griffin Pest Solutions in Kalamazoo, Mich., uses dusts as a critical role in reaching harborage points, such as “door casings, window casings, behind light switch covers and pipe chases, and in commercial kitchens behind the metal panels and the stainless steel panels.” He says that “whatever crawls in there is going to die,” as dusts kill on contact, kill multiple types of pests, and last for years.

Dusts are “very long-lasting,” says O’Connor, and “it’s not really a chemical kill, it’s a mechanical dehydration kill.” The dust adheres to the cockroach’s body and then causes quick rehydration and sudden death.

English cautions that “you do not want to pack [the dust] on too thick; you want a light, light mist of dust.” The finer the level of dust that is applied, the more likely the dust will stick to the cockroach that will then ingest the dust during the grooming process.

Certain dusts also work very well in damp areas. English said, “We love using” dusts designed for use in damp places. “It’s long-lasting and it can get wet. If it gets wet, it doesn’t lose its effectiveness,” he says, since other products that get wet will stop working. “If you look at your arsenal, [dusts are]

the longest-lasting defense of any of [the products],” he says. A gel bait will eventually “dry up,” but a dust will “last, last, last.”

SAFETY.

“Dust can be an effective, inexpensive and low risk (to animal and human health and the environment),” according to the Mallis Handbook of Pest Control.

Some dusts, too, offer very low toxicity levels. As a result, O’Connor uses dusts during regular maintenance. Moyer says that with these dusts, “the toxicity level is almost nothing, so you don’t have to worry about the guy that dusts the pipe chasings,” some of the product falls off of the surface area, and “he doesn’t clean it up.” (PCT Online, December 19, 2019) <https://www.pctonline.com/article/dusts-cockroach-management/>

US EPA READY TO RENEW ATRAZINE

Proposed decision imposes new mitigation measures on the herbicide, atrazine, but falls short for environmentalists.

The Trump administration has proposed renewing registrations for the herbicide, atrazine, with new restrictions intended to reduce exposure.

Some 72 million lbs. (32.7 million kgs.) of atrazine are used annually on some 75 million acres (30.4 million ha) of crops to control grasses and broadleaf weeds. It is the second most used pesticide in the US – applications to maize, sorghum and sugarcane account for more than 98% of the total use.

The EPA acknowledged in its interim registration decision that while there are “potential risks of concern” from the continued use of atrazine, the adoption of the new mitigation measures means that the risks to human health and the environment are

“outweighed by the benefits associated” with use of the herbicide.

The proposal will reduce maximum application rates for atrazine used on residential turf and also imposes limits to mitigate spray drift, including wind speed restrictions, application technology requirements and a ban on spraying during a temperature inversion. Other label changes include new protective equipment and handling requirements for atrazine applicators.

The decision is based on an ecological risk assessment completed by the EPA in 2016 and a human health assessment finished last year. The EPA last reviewed atrazine in 2003 – the herbicide was first approved for agricultural use in 1948.

The interim decision drew swift praise from ag interests.

“The impact atrazine has in weed control and making no-till production possible is as vital today as it was over 50 years ago when the product was brought to market,” said Kentucky Corn Growers Association Executive Director Laura Knoth. “We appreciate the years EPA has spent reviewing and ensuring the safety and effectiveness of atrazine.”

But environmentalists are furious and say that the EPA is ignoring ample evidence that the herbicide is an endocrine disruptor and should be more heavily restricted or phased out entirely. The EU banned atrazine in 2004 because of concerns about drinking water contamination and dozens of other countries have followed suit.

Critics of the new EPA proposal say that a change to the regulatory threshold intended to protect aquatic species fails to consider the toxicity of the herbicide and the potential risks to children and other vulnerable populations.

The EPA will take public comment on its proposal for 60 days once it has been published in the Federal Register. (AGROW, December 23, 2019)

CEU Meetings

Date: January 7-8, 2020

Title: 2020 Arkansas/Oklahoma Turfgrass Short Course

Location: Arkansas Cooperative Extension office, Education Wing – Auditorium, 2301 S. University Ave Little Rock AR

Contact: Dr. Matthew Bertucci (479) 575-3979
bertucci@uark.edu

<https://horticulture.uark.edu/research-extension/turf/turf-education/shortcourse.php>

CEU's:	Category(s):
5	3A
5	10

Date: January 16, 2020

Title: 2020 Annual Southeastern Oklahoma Turf & Landscape Workshop

Location: Murray State College 1 Murray Campus Drive, Tishomingo OK

Contact: Johnston County OSU Extension
(580) 371-9533 sharyne.pitmon@okstate.edu

CEU's:	Category(s):
8	3A
2	5
2	6
8	10

Date: January 16, 2020

Title: Johnston Seed Turfgrass & Ornamental Pesticide CEU Workshop

Location: Enid OK

Contact: Robert Wiebelt
(580) 249-4449

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

Date: January 20-21, 2020
Title: 2020 OAAA Conference
Location: Embassy Suites Norman OK
Contact: Sandy Wells (405) 431-0381
sandy@okaaa.org
<http://www.okaaa.org/>

CEU's:	Category(s):
6	A
8	1A
3	3A
3	5
3	6
3	8
9	10

Date: January 22-23, 2020
Title: Red River Crop Conference
Location: Southwest Technology Center Altus OK
Contact: Gary Strickland (580) 477-7962

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	1A

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://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

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/.

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**