

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



July, 2020

CHEM

- 1 JULY PRACTICAL SCHOOLS FOR CATEGORIES 7A, 7B, CERTIFICATION
- 2 EPA RESPONDS TO NINTH CIRCUIT VACATUR OF DICAMBA REGISTRATIONS
- 2 EPA RELEASES GUIDANCE ON PESTICIDE SAFETY TRAINING REQUIREMENTS DURING COVID-19
- 3 EPA ISSUES ADVISORY ON DISINFECTANTS MAKING FALSE AND MISLEADING COVID-19 CLAIMS
- 3 SWEEPING BAYER SETTLEMENTS
- 5 TICK SURVEILLANCE, CONTROL NEEDED IN UNITED STATES, STUDY SHOWS
- 8 COURT BARS CALIFORNIA CANCER WARNINGS FOR GLYPHOSATE
- 9 NO REVERSAL ON DICAMBA
- 10 TERMINIX UNCOVERS TOP MOSQUITO MYTHS
- 11 US COURT URGED TO COMPEL EPA TO BAN DICAMBA SPRAYING
- 12 CEU MEETINGS
- 12 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 13 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

JULY PRACTICAL SCHOOLS FOR CATEGORIES 7A, 7B, CERTIFICATION

The OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program in conjunction with ODAFF will hold practical schools for categories 7A (General Pest), 7B (Structural) in Stillwater to complete certification for these categories. The next training schools will be in July 14 for 7A General Pest and July 15-16 for 7B Structural.

New procedures for the classes will be implemented such as reducing class size to aid in social distancing, requiring faces masks for everyone in attendance, and sanitizing surfaces regularly.

Class size has been reduced to 8 people maximum per class sizes and enrollment is first come first served until the class is full. To see all the dates available please go to our webpage at <http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm>

(OSU PSEP)

EPA RESPONDS TO NINTH CIRCUIT VACATUR OF DICAMBA REGISTRATIONS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Andrew Wheeler released the following statement on the Ninth Circuit Vacatur of dicamba registrations:

“We are disappointed with the decision. The 2020 growing season is well underway and this creates undue burden for our first conservationists – farmers. EPA has been overwhelmed with letters and calls from farmers nationwide since the Court issued its opinion, and these testimonies cite the devastation of this decision on their crops and the threat to America’s food supply. The Court itself noted in this order that it will place a great hardship on America’s farmers. This ruling implicates millions of acres of crops, millions of dollars already spent by farmers, and the food and fiber Americans across the country rely on to feed their families.”

“EPA is assessing all avenues to mitigate the impact of the Court’s decision on farmers.”

Background

The order addresses three registrations containing the active ingredient dicamba (Xtendimax with Vaporgrip Technology (EPA Reg. No. 524-617), Engenia – (EPA Reg. No. 7969-345), FeXapan – (EPA Reg. No. 352-913), which is a valuable pest control tool for America’s farmers.(EPA June 5, 2019) <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-responds-ninth-circuit-vacatur-dicamba-registrations>

Note: EPA has allowed application of existing stocks of these products in the court order until July 31, 2020 for over the top applications to cotton sand soybeans. After those dates no more applications can be made of these products. For more information, please see the fact sheets produced by OSU Weed Scientists Dr. Todd

Baughman and Dr. Misha Manuchehri. (OSU PSEP)
PSS-2195 for soybeans
<http://pods.dasnr.okstate.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-11833/PSS-2195.pdf>

PSS-2196 for cotton
<http://pods.dasnr.okstate.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-11835/PSS-2196.pdf>

EPA RELEASES GUIDANCE ON PESTICIDE SAFETY TRAINING REQUIREMENTS DURING COVID-19

Agricultural workers and pesticide handlers directly support the nation’s agricultural production and food supply and EPA is committed to ensuring they are protected from workplace hazards.

EPA has released guidance regarding the annual pesticide safety training requirements outlined in the Agricultural Worker Protection Standard (WPS) that offers flexibility during the COVID-19 public health emergency.

The Agency is aware that COVID-19 may make it difficult for agricultural employers and handler employers to provide WPS pesticide safety training or hire agricultural workers and pesticide handlers who have been trained in the last 12 months, as required by the WPS.

In response, the guidance aims to inform agricultural employers and handler employers of flexibilities available under the WPS to allow continued protection for employees and agricultural production:

- EPA encourages in-person training if workplace protections to maintain a healthy work environment are able to be implemented. For example, an employer may be able to provide pesticide safety training outside, in smaller than usual groups with well-spaced participants.

- Alternatively, WPS training can be presented remotely, provided all WPS training requirements are met.
- The employer is ultimately responsible for ensuring the training meets all requirements outlined in the WPS. For example, the training must still be presented in a manner the trainees can understand, in an environment reasonably free from distractions, and cover the full training content using EPA-approved training materials.
- Once the training ends, the employer must document successful completion under a qualified trainer.

To read the guidance in full and to learn more about [EPA's Worker Protection Standard](#), visit [our webpage](#).

(EPA June 18, 2020)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-guidance-pesticide-safety-training-requirements-during-covid-19>

EPA ISSUES ADVISORY ON DISINFECTANTS MAKING FALSE AND MISLEADING COVID-19 CLAIMS

This week, EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance released a [compliance advisory on products claiming to kill SARS-CoV-2](#), the novel coronavirus that causes COVID-19.

The advisory reiterates that disinfectant products that claim to kill viruses must be registered with EPA before they can be sold. Pesticide products cannot legally make claims that they kill a particular pathogen such as SARS-CoV-2 unless EPA has authorized the claim during the registration process. The full text of the advisory can be found [here](#).

EPA is receiving a steady stream of tips and complaints concerning potentially false or misleading claims, including efficacy claims, associated with pesticides and devices. EPA is actively reviewing these claims and is working to identify others. EPA intends to pursue enforcement for those products making false and misleading claims regarding SARS-CoV-2. You can report tips to EPA [here](#). (EPA June, 1 2020)
<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-issues-advisory-disinfectants-making-false-and-misleading-covid-19-claims>

SWEEPING BAYER SETTLEMENTS

Bayer Announces Multi-Billion-Dollar Settlement to Address Glyphosate, Dicamba Litigation

Bayer has reached a multi-billion-dollar, wide-reaching settlement agreement on Wednesday to end Roundup cancer lawsuits, dicamba drift litigation and polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCB, water litigation.

Most notably, the company announced in a news release a total payment of between \$8.8 billion and \$9.6 billion to "resolve current and address potential future Roundup litigation."

By the company's estimates, the settlement will "bring closure" to about 75% of current Roundup litigation involving about 125,000 filed and unfiled claims.

The company will also pay up to \$400 million to resolve litigation pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri on claims of crop injury and harm from Bayer's dicamba herbicide, XtendiMax.

Finally, the settlement package will direct about \$650 million to address litigation on PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) in water.

"Cash payments related to the settlements are expected to start in 2020," the company stated in its press release on the settlements. "Bayer currently assumes that the potential cash outflow will not exceed \$5 billion in 2020 and \$5 billion in 2021; the remaining balance would be paid in 2022 or thereafter."

GLYPHOSATE SETTLEMENT

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

Bayer said the settlement includes about 95% of cases currently set for trial and "establish key values and parameters to guide the resolution of the remainder of the claims as negotiations advance."

The settlement also will include an allowance to cover unresolved claims, Bayer said, and "\$1.25 billion to support a separate class agreement to address potential future litigation."

The agreement will be subject to approval by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

"First and foremost, the Roundup settlement is the right action at the right time for Bayer to bring a long period of uncertainty to an end," Bayer Chief Executive Officer Werner Baumann, said in a statement.

"It resolves most current claims and puts in place a clear mechanism to manage risks of potential future litigation. It is financially reasonable when viewed against the significant financial risks of continued, multi-year litigation and the related impacts to our reputation and to our business."

Bayer said that before deciding to settle, it considered the alternative course of continuing to litigate cases.

"In the company's risk assessment, potential negative outcomes of further litigation, including more advertising and growing numbers of plaintiffs, upwards of 20 trials per year and uncertain jury outcomes, and associated reputational and business impacts, likely would substantially exceed the settlement and related costs," the company said in the news release.

The settlement does not cover three California cases currently on appeal.

In May 2019, a California jury awarded \$2.055 billion in damages to a couple that has battled cancer after decades of using the product. The couple, both in their 70s, were each diagnosed with the same type of non-Hodgkin lymphoma.

At the end of March 2019, a California jury awarded \$80 million to a man with non-Hodgkin lymphoma who had used glyphosate at an animal refuge for nearly 30 years.

In 2018, another jury in the state awarded \$289 million to a groundskeeper with cancer who used the chemical. The award was later reduced to \$78 million.

Nathan Donley, a senior scientist at the Center for Biological Diversity, said in a statement to DTN that the settlement doesn't change the risks of glyphosate.

"Even Bayer's billions can't magically make glyphosate's well-documented links to cancer disappear," he said.

National Association of Wheat Growers President and Michigan farmer Dave Milligan said Bayer's settlement was important for farmers who rely on the product.

"Wheat growers work every day to produce a safe, affordable crop that balances crop rotation, input costs, production goals, and improvement of natural resources to protect the long-term sustainability of their farming operation," Milligan said in a statement.

"To achieve this goal, growers need all available tools at their disposal including glyphosate."

DICAMBA LITIGATION

The company also announced a settlement on litigation concerning its dicamba herbicide, XtendiMax, which is alleged to have caused damage to sensitive crops for several years now.

The company said it has agreed to pay up to \$400 million to resolve multi-district litigation pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, as well as on claims for the 2015-2020 crop years.

"Claimants will be required to provide proof of damage to crop yields and evidence that it was due to dicamba in order to collect," Bayer's press release stated. "The company expects a contribution from its co-defendant, BASF, towards this settlement." BASF owns and sells Engenia, another dicamba herbicide for use in dicamba-tolerant crops.

"Bayer stands strongly behind the safety and utility of its XtendiMax herbicide with VaporGrip technology and continues to enhance training and education efforts to help ensure growers use these products successfully," Bayer said in the news release.

The Bader Farm dicamba lawsuit, which ended in a jury ordering Bayer and BASF to pay \$325 million to a peach farm injured by dicamba, is not included in this settlement. Bayer vowed to continue to fight that ruling in its press release.

The future use of dicamba herbicides over the top of dicamba-tolerant crops has been thrown into jeopardy recently, after a Ninth Circuit ruling vacating the registrations of three of four OTT dicamba herbicides, including XtendiMax. See more here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

PCB SETTLEMENT

Bayer also announced a series of settlement agreements to resolve cases representing "most" of

the company's exposure to PCB water litigation, the company said. Bayer will pay a total of about \$650 million to the class.

Monsanto manufactured PCBs until 1977. One agreement establishes a class to include all local governments with EPA permits involving water discharges impaired by PCBs.

The company said it entered into separate agreements with the attorneys general in New Mexico, Washington, and the District of Columbia to resolve similar PCB claims, totaling around \$170 million.

Bayer said it will finance all of these settlements via "existing surplus liquidity, future free cash flows, the proceeds from the Animal Health divestment, and additional bond issuances, which will provide flexibility in managing the settlement payments as well as upcoming debt maturities."

(Progressive Farmer, May 14, 2020)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/05/15/usda-deregulate-certain-genetically>

TICK SURVEILLANCE, CONTROL NEEDED IN UNITED STATES, STUDY SHOWS

The prevalence of Lyme disease and other tick-borne illnesses has steadily increased in the U.S. over the past 20 years. Now, an inaugural nationwide study of tick surveillance and control describes a clear need for more funding and coordination among programs across the country.

Among the coauthors is a [Texas A&M AgriLife](#) researcher, Pete Teel, Ph.D., a Regents professor in the [Texas A&M Department of Entomology](#). Teel said that while Texas has monitored and controlled ticks since 1893, a nationwide database is needed.

The study's authors surveyed 140 vector-borne disease professionals working at state, county and local agencies in fall 2018. Reaching even that

many respondents proved challenging, the authors said. No central database of tick-management programs or contacts was available.\

The survey's aim was to learn about programs' objectives and capabilities for tick surveillance and control. Respondents were also asked whether they tested ticks for disease-causing germs, and about barriers to success.

Nationwide, less than half of public health and vector-control agencies engage in active tick surveillance, according to the survey. Only 12% of the surveyed agencies directly conduct or otherwise support tick-control efforts.

The study appeared on [June 17 in the Journal of Medical Entomology](#). In addition to Teel, the authors were from Cornell University; University of Florida, Gainesville; University of California, Davis; University of Illinois; and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Division of Vector-Borne Diseases. The authors are also affiliated with the CDC's five Vector-Borne Disease Regional Centers of Excellence.

"Ticks are responsible for the majority of our vector-borne illnesses in the U.S., and our programming does not adequately meet the need in its current form, for both surveillance and control," said Emily Mader, public health researcher, lead author on the study and program manager at the Northeast Regional Center for Excellence in Vector-Borne Diseases, led by Cornell University.

Texas has a long history of tick surveillance

In Texas, early detection and control have led to discoveries of exotic ticks, Teel said. These efforts kept the ticks from becoming established.

"These ticks could have introduced several devastating diseases with high risks for humans, livestock and wildlife," he said. "National databases for the kinds of ticks that are present, and how those populations change with time and space, would be hugely informative for public health and animal health needs."

Texas has engaged in tick surveillance and control activities since 1893. At that time, the 23rd Texas Legislature established the Livestock Sanitary Commission, which later became the Texas Animal Health Commission.

"I believe this to be the oldest and longest continuous tick surveillance program in North America," said Teel. The commission's aim was to protect livestock from dangerous diseases such as cattle fever.

The resulting state and federal cattle fever tick eradication program eliminated these ticks from 14 states by the 1940s. The program established a permanent quarantine zone along the Texas-Mexico border and has protected the U.S. cattle industry ever since. Statewide tick surveillance activities continue today.

"Today, the data from this program are becoming valuable and complimentary to public health needs," Teel said. "Collaborations are growing in Texas to share information, improve surveillance and testing, train a new generation of vector biologists, and improve best practices for tick control and tick-borne disease prevention."

One such collaboration is the Western Gulf Center of Excellence in Vector-Borne Diseases, where AgriLife is a partner. Other collaborators include academic institutions and public health and animal health agencies in Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana. Led by the University of Texas Medical Branch, the center performs research to expand surveillance for ticks and tick-borne pathogens. The center also trains future scientists and public health practitioners.

Highlights from the nationwide survey of tick-management programs

Less than half of tick-management programs proactively collect ticks in their area

About two-thirds of respondents, 65%, said their programs engage in passive tick surveillance, such as accepting tick samples submitted by the public.

However, only 46% said their programs engage in routine active tick surveillance, such as focused collection of tick samples within their community.

Only a quarter of tick-management programs test ticks for disease-causing germs

Survey respondents from Texas are among the 26% nationwide who said their jurisdiction conducts or financially supports testing of tick samples for disease-causing pathogens. Only 7% of respondents nationwide said their programs work to detect such pathogens in animal hosts, such as mice, that can pass the pathogens to ticks in their area.

“Pathogen testing is an essential component of surveillance and is needed in order to understand tick-borne disease risk to communities,” said Mader. “There appears to be a significant barrier for many tick-surveillance programs across the country to access pathogen-testing services.”

Capacity for public tick-control efforts is low

Texas provides financial support for tick control. Yet nationwide, only 12% of respondents said their jurisdiction conducts or financially supports tick control. Those efforts primarily focused on reducing tick presence on animal hosts such as deer and rodents.

Mader said limited resources mean tick-management programs need reliable, proven control methods.

“They are not going to invest in a strategy unless it has been investigated and shown to make a difference in reducing the burden of ticks and tickborne diseases,” she said. “Right now, supporting this research is a major need. These kinds of evaluations often take at least three years to complete and require a significant investment.”

Tick surveillance and control happen in a range of sectors

The most common employment sectors among respondents was public health, mosquito control,

cooperative extension and agriculture. More than half of respondents, 57%, said their programs work with academic partners such as Texas A&M AgriLife to conduct tick surveillance.

Info and data sharing on ticks and public health is lagging

Less than a quarter of respondents, 23%, said their tick-management programs disseminate information to local health departments. Just 14% report data to the CDC.

Greater support for tick-management programs is critical. Respondents commonly cited the need for stable funding, training for personnel, and standardized, research-based guidance and protocols.

Recent national efforts begin to improve the tick situation

In December 2019, the Kay Hagan Tick Act authorized \$150 million to strengthen the nation’s efforts on vector-borne disease. The act included funding the CDC’s Vector-Borne Disease Regional Centers of Excellence for an additional five years, through 2026. In the past two years, the CDC also issued guidance on the best practices for surveillance of several tick species.

These steps address several needs that survey responders had highlighted. The authors said the survey will serve as an important baseline from which to measure future progress and improvement.

(PCT Online, June 22, 2020)

<https://www.pctonline.com/article/tick-surveillance-control-needed-texas-am/>

COURT BARS CALIFORNIA CANCER WARNINGS FOR GLYPHOSATE

A US federal judge has blocked California from requiring a cancer warning on glyphosate-based pesticide products. US District Judge William Shubb concluded that the “great weight of evidence” indicated that the widely used herbicide was not a known carcinogen.

Judge Shubb reaffirmed this week his earlier ruling that cancer warnings for glyphosate would be misleading and in violation of the US Constitution's First Amendment guaranteeing free speech, handing a major win to a coalition of ag interests, food producers and pesticide manufacturers who had challenged the Proposition 65 listing for glyphosate.

California added the herbicide to its Proposition 65 list of cancer-causing chemicals in [July 2017](#), a move that relied on the International Agency for Research on Cancer's (IARC) [2015 declaration](#) that glyphosate was a “probable human carcinogen”.

Officials with the state's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment explained that the IARC was one of the "authoritative bodies" that could be relied upon for listing a chemical under 1986 law that implemented Prop 65. They argued that the IARC's declaration effectively required the state to add the popular weed killer to the list of chemicals known to cause cancer or reproductive harm.

The National Association of Wheat Growers, along with Monsanto, CropLife America, and an array of agricultural and food interests filed suit in [November 2017](#) in the US District Court for the Eastern District of California to block the listing, questioning the dependence on the IARC declaration and arguing that warning label requirements would violate their constitutional protections for commercial speech under the First Amendment. [Eleven states](#) intervened on behalf of the plaintiffs, who may have reason to be optimistic

that they may prevail and upend the glyphosate listing.

Judge Shubb imposed a [preliminary injunction](#) in February 2018 that blocked the state from requiring cancer warnings until the litigation had been resolved. The judge determined that a cancer notice for glyphosate would not be "factually accurate" as the "heavy weight of evidence in the record" shows that the herbicide is not a human carcinogen.

The judge put the [case on hold](#) in September 2018 at the request of California officials, who wanted to wait for the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to issue rulings in two cases that were also focused on compelled disclosure requirements. The judge [revived the case](#) in August 2019.

In his 34-page ruling, Judge Shubb said nothing had changed to warrant him to side with the state.

The fact there have been additional studies suggesting a link between glyphosate and cancer as well as some criticism of the EPA's review of the herbicide “does not establish that California knows that glyphosate causes cancer”, the judge said. “Notwithstanding this additional evidence, the fact remains that every government regulator of which the court is aware, with the exception of the IARC, has found that there was no or insufficient evidence that glyphosate causes cancer.”

“While it may be literally true that California technically “knows” that glyphosate causes cancer as the state has defined that term in the statute and regulations, the required warning would nonetheless be misleading to the ordinary consumer,” Judge Shubb added. “The state of California may not skew the public debate by forcing companies to adopt the state's determination that glyphosate is a carcinogen, relying solely on the IARC's determination, when the great weight of evidence indicates that glyphosate is not known to cause cancer.”

It is not the listing of glyphosate, but the warning requirements that pose First Amendment concerns, the Judge said, adding that he was not convinced by

California's assurances that most products fell within the safe harbour level set by OEHHA and thus would not need labels.

"The no significant risk level only provides an affirmative defence for a business when faced with a Proposition 65 enforcement action, and it has no relevance as to whether the warning requirement is factual and uncontroversial," Judge Shubb said.

Promises that the state can craft a "nuance warning" for glyphosate products also fell flat for Judge Shubb, who criticised California's Attorney General, Xavier Becerra, for proclaiming "the need to broadcast glyphosate's cancer risk while at the same time declaring there is no risk for the vast majority of consumers".

"The court cannot condone the state's approach here, where it continues to argue that the warning requirement poses no First Amendment concerns and then repeatedly proposes iterations of alternative warnings that the state would never allow under normal circumstances, absent this lawsuit," he concluded.

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, June 24, 2020)

NO REVERSAL ON DICAMBA

Late on Thursday, June 25, a panel of judges on the Ninth Circuit denied a motion by BASF to stay and recall their June 3 mandate vacating three dicamba registrations, including BASF's Engenia herbicide.

The move puts dicamba registrants back where they started the month: with three of four over-the-top dicamba herbicides no longer federally registered for use.

For now, farmers and commercial applicators may still apply any existing stocks of the herbicides in their possession as of June 3, according to an EPA cancellation order issued June 8. They must follow the former labels, as well as any dicamba-specific

state rules in place, including some cutoff dates that have already taken effect.

But beyond 2020, the future of the three dicamba registrations, Bayer's XtendiMax, BASF's Engenia and Corteva's FeXapan, remain uncertain.

BASF had argued that the judges should recall their mandate for a number of reasons. First, the company claims it was not aware that its Engenia herbicide was at stake in the case before the June 3 decision, and did not get sufficient opportunity to defend its product to the court.

Second, when the judges issued their decision to vacate the registrations on June 3, they took the unusual step of issuing the mandate -- which gave the decision the force of law -- immediately afterward. Federal rules of appellate procedure typically require a period of seven days between a decision and a mandate, Brigit Rollins, a staff attorney for the National Agricultural Law Center, explained on a webinar given this week on the topic. And if one party is a federal agency, that required time can stretch to 51 days, Rollins noted.

However, the Ninth Circuit has its own local rules that allow three-judge panels to issue a mandate on the same day if the decision is issued under "exceptional circumstances." BASF argued this was not the case for the judges' decision to vacate the registrations.

The court disagreed. It issued a single statement, with no accompanying opinion, that BASF's motion was denied.

See more on this case here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...> and here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

(Progressive Farmer, June 25, 2020)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/06/26/judges-deny-basfs-motion-dicamba>

TERMINIX UNCOVERS TOP MOSQUITO MYTHS

Terminix recently helped educate the public about mosquitoes and the serious diseases they can transmit, such as West Nile Virus, St. Louis encephalitis, and, globally, Zika, malaria and dengue. With travel and vacation on hold for millions across the country this summer, outdoor living spaces have become a place for families to escape. So, keeping them comfortable and pest-free is more important than ever.

“Protecting homes and families is at the heart of everything we do,” said Kim Scott, president of Terminix Residential. “For the last several months, our homes have also served as our offices and our schools. As Summer begins, backyards are becoming staycation spots for many families. We want to protect those outdoor spaces and the special moments that bring our customers joy, so they can focus on what matters most.”

Understanding misconceptions about mosquitoes, such as what attracts them and how to effectively keep them away from homes and yards, is critical to keeping families safe and backyards protected this summer.

Mosquito Myths

Myth 1: Mosquitoes need a lot of water to breed.

Truth: Mosquitoes can breed in a very small amount of stagnant water, such as standing water in buckets, bird baths, tires, tarps, flowerpots and trash can lids. Rid your yard of these water sources every three to five days to help control the mosquito population. Check for standing water often as mosquitoes can lay thousands of eggs in just a couple of weeks. Mosquitoes require water to complete their life cycle. So, by eliminating their water source, you eliminate their offspring.

Myth 2: Mosquitoes aren't that dangerous.

Truth: Mosquitoes are considered the deadliest animal on earth, spreading diseases such as malaria, Zika and West Nile virus to people across the globe.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) note that mosquitoes kill more people than any other creature in the world.

Myth 3: Mosquitoes are only dangerous to humans.

Truth: Mosquitoes can bite and spread diseases to animals, including your pets. Mosquito-borne diseases kill countless birds, reptiles, dogs, horses and endangered species each year. Mosquito bites can cause canine heartworm, Eastern Equine Encephalitis and Western Equine Encephalitis in animals.

Myth 4: Do-it-yourself (DIY) mosquito control techniques are good enough.

Truth: DIY Methods might help you temporarily get rid of adult mosquitoes, but they won't help with the thousands of eggs that could be ready to hatch at any moment. What's more, there is little scientific evidence supporting the effectiveness of citronella candles, dryer sheets, ultrasonic devices and other DIY methods. Bug zappers may eliminate some mosquitoes; however, the light itself can actually attract even more mosquitoes, thereby increasing the population in your yard.

Myth 5: It's not a "bad year" for mosquitoes so I don't need to worry about them in my yard.

Truth: This year in particular Americans are spending more time at home and outdoors in an effort to social distance. Patios, porches, decks and rooftops are all excellent places for families — and mosquitoes — to gather. Mosquitoes effect populations that live in temperatures above 50 degrees, meaning they're a nuisance across the globe, but they especially effect coastal zones and areas with hot, humid climates. When you take steps to control the mosquito population in your yard, you're doing your part to help protect your family, neighborhood and community.

(PCT Online, June 29, 2020)

<https://www.pctonline.com/article/terminix-mosquitoes-myths-national-mosquito-awareness-week/>

US COURT URGED TO COMPEL EPA TO BAN DICAMBA SPRAYING

The US EPA has defied a judicial order to ban over-the-top uses of three dicamba herbicides and its decision to allow use of existing stocks “flies in the face” of the court’s mandate, environmentalists and farmworker advocates said Thursday (June 18th) in a filing with the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

“From top to bottom, EPA simply disregarded the Court’s findings and holdings,” the groups said in support of an emergency motion that asks the three-judge panel to compel the agency to ban OTT uses of the products and hold EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler in contempt.

At issue is Mr Wheeler’s June 8th [cancellation order](#) for three dicamba herbicides – Bayer’s XtendiMax, BASF’s Engenia and Corteva’s FeXapan – that also allowed farmers to spray some 4 million gallons of existing stocks until the end of July.

The pesticides were approved by the EPA to be sprayed on cotton and soybeans genetically modified to tolerate dicamba, but problems with drift and damage to non-target crops have sparked widespread debate about the safety of the herbicides.

The National Family Farm Coalition, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Food Safety, and Pesticide Action Network successfully challenged the 2108 conditional registrations, arguing that the EPA had violated the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The Court concluded that the EPA had “substantially understated the risks it acknowledged and failed entirely to acknowledge other risks” in

violation of the FIFRA when it approved use of the pesticides on GM cotton and soybeans in 34 states.

The Court acknowledged that vacating the registrations could be an obstacle for farmers – an estimated 60 million acres (24 million ha) of dicamba-tolerant cotton and soybeans have been planted this year – but said it had little choice given the “absence of substantial evidence to support the EPA’s decision”.

Mr Wheeler’s order to allow existing uses was hailed by farm groups, agricultural retailers, the pesticide industry, state agriculture officials and USDA Secretary Sonny Perdue. In its response to the petitioners’ emergency motion, the Agency called its decision a “necessary and responsible regulatory action” that is “expressly authorised” by FIFRA and consistent with the Ninth Circuit’s order.

The petitioners’ reply argues that the EPA is wrongly suggesting that the Court vacated the entire registrations, not just the OTT uses that were added to the conditional registration – and so includes non-OTT use for weed control in asparagus, maize and sorghum – in November 2018.

“The challenged decision is only EPA’s decision to register conditionally these OTT new rules,” the groups say, calling the Agency’s justification to allow continued OTT uses “illusory.”

During the litigation, the EPA argued against vacatur, calling on the Court to remand the registrations lest the pesticides become unusable for the 2020 growing season, the petitioners say.

For the Agency’s current view to be correct, those arguments would have been “intentional fabrications,” according the National Family Farm Coalition and its allies.

“Farmers at imminent risk from dicamba drift, including those petitioners represent, were fooled into thinking spraying could ever be halted by judicial intervention,” they argue. “For [the EPA’s] view to be correct, then the Court’s careful weighing of the remedy, its rationale, and ultimate decision to vacate, was all just a rigged game.”

The Court was clear in the message that OTT uses are no longer registered, the petitioners say, adding that the “EPA simply did not get the message, or more likely, defied it in a contempt worthy action”.

The groups also contest the EPA’s view that the cancellation order is a new agency action that must be challenged in district court, a view they call “devious”.

“This Court has jurisdiction to enforce its mandate and the administrative order is simply not a proper separate and new action when EPA issued it to override this Court’s vacatur,” they contend.

EPA’s action was “not just inconsistent with the Court’s decision but antithetical to it”, the petitioners conclude. “The Court should recall the mandate, enforce its decision, issue declaratory relief, and find EPA in contempt.”

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, June 24, 2020)

CEU Meetings

None Available

ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

Online Pest Control Courses

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

PestED.com

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

Certified Training Institute

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

WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

CEU University

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

Technical Learning College

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

All Star Pro Training

www.allstarce.com

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

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

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

Find us on Twitter at
@OkstatePestEd

**Pesticide Safety
Education Program**