

# PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



October, 2020

CHEM

- 1 TEST HELP WORKSHOP SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER IN OKLAHOMA CITY
- 2 NEW LOOK FOR THE OSU PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM WEBSITE
- 2 EPA PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT REDUCING PESTICIDE IMPACTS TO ENDANGERED SPECIES
- 2 EPA TAKES NEXT STEP IN REVIEW PROCESS FOR INSECTICIDE CHLORPYRIFOS, MAKING DRAFT RISK ASSESSMENTS AVAILABLE
- 3 CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR SIGNS BILL BANNING MOST RODENTICIDE USES
- 4 EPA'S DICAMBA TO-DO LIST
- 6 INTERIM MEASURES FOR ATRAZINE COMPLETED
- 7 STATES BACK CHALLENGE OF US EPA INSECTICIDE APPROVAL
- 8 USDA ARS SCIENTISTS WORKING TO BRING MORE WEAPONS TO FIGHT MOSQUITOES
- 9 ENLIST RULING APPEALED
- 10 US EPA RECOMMENDS ACTION TO REDUCE NALED RISKS
- 11 CEU MEETINGS
- 11 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 12 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

## TEST HELP WORKSHOP SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The Oklahoma State University Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has scheduled a test help workshop for October 19, 2020 in Oklahoma City. The workshop will be held at the Oklahoma County Extension Center at 2500 N.E. 63<sup>rd</sup> St. in Oklahoma City.

With new social distance and safety procedures class size is limited and mask are required to be worn at all times during the program.

Cost is \$50 and will include a copy of Applying Pesticides Correctly which is the study manual for the core and service technician exams. To register for this class please go to the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) website at <http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm> and click on the register online link. (OSU PSEP)

## **NEW LOOK FOR THE OSU PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM WEBSITE**

OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has a new look for the webpage at <http://pested.okstate.edu>.

Information that was on the old website design is at the new site but things might be in a new location. Oklahoma State University has adopted this web page format to be easier to use and more mobile device friendly when navigating OSU webpages.

If you have any questions or are having difficulty finding items, please contact Charles Luper at (405) 744-5808 for help.

(OSU PSEP)

## **EPA PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT REDUCING PESTICIDE IMPACTS TO ENDANGERED SPECIES**

EPA is providing materials to help the public and pesticide applicators protect endangered species and their critical habitats.

Information on possible risk reduction measures, such as best management practices to reduce exposures and impacts to federally threatened and endangered species, can now be found on [our website](#).

These materials came out of EPA's consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on registrations of pesticide products containing the insecticides [chlorpyrifos](#), [diazinon](#) and [malathion](#).

In December 2017, NMFS issued a final biological opinion on these three chemicals as part of a consultation process. [Read the biological](#)

[opinion here](#). A biological opinion provides a view of whether the pesticide's registered use is likely to jeopardize a species, and if so, describes alternatives to avoid jeopardy.

EPA re-initiated consultation with NMFS to allow for consideration of additional information. The Agency remains in consultation with NMFS as they revise their biological opinion.

Additional information on the re-initiated consultation is available on [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) with the docket number EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0141.

Review the new materials on [our website](#).

(EPA September 23, 2020)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-provides-information-about-reducing-pesticide-impacts-endangered-species>

## **EPA TAKES NEXT STEP IN REVIEW PROCESS FOR INSECTICIDE CHLORPYRIFOS, MAKING DRAFT RISK ASSESSMENTS AVAILABLE**

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking an important step in the Agency's review of chlorpyrifos. Meeting an important commitment made in the Agency's [July 2019 response to the related petition denial](#), EPA has released its draft risk assessments for chlorpyrifos for public review. These draft risk assessments are the next stage in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) registration review process and are not a denial or approval of the insecticide.

The draft risk assessments are the product of an extensive evaluation of available data on chlorpyrifos's health and environmental impacts. Specific findings include:

- The revised human health risk assessment identifies dietary (including children) and occupational handler risks of concern and incorporates the updated drinking water assessment.
- With the limited remaining residential uses of chlorpyrifos EPA found no risks of concern, including to children’s health, when products are used according to the label instructions.
- The Agency’s draft ecological risk assessment identifies potential adverse effects to mammals, birds, fish, and terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates.

Full details on these potential risks and EPA’s methods for estimating them can be found within the revised human health and draft ecological risk assessments [located on the Agency’s website](#).

EPA will take public comment on the draft risk assessments (DRAs) during the same 60-day public comment period that the Agency plans to open when it issues its Proposed Interim Decision (PID) in October 2020. The PID, which is the next step in the FIFRA process, will outline potential risk management options for this insecticide to address any potential risks of concern identified in the DRAs.

By holding the comment period at the same time as the Proposed Interim Decision, the public will have access to more information on chlorpyrifos and can provide the Agency with more informed, robust comments. EPA will review and respond to comments for both documents prior to issuing an Interim Decision.

EPA will also consider the input and recommendations from the September 2020 FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) meeting once the SAP report is released in December 2020. Depending on the SAP’s conclusions, EPA may further revise the human health risk assessment. After a thorough review of the best available science and carefully considering scientific peer review and public comments, EPA will then

determine the next steps in the registration review process for chlorpyrifos.

EPA September 22, 2020)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-takes-next-step-review-process-insecticide-chlorpyrifos-making-draft-risk-assessments>

## **CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR SIGNS BILL BANNING MOST RODENTICIDE USES**

California Gov. Gavin Newsom on Sept. 29 [signed into law AB 1788](#), “The California Ecosystems Protection Act,” which prohibits most uses of second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides (SGARs). AB 1788 was [passed by the California Legislature on Aug. 31](#).

AB 1788 prohibits most uses of rodenticides containing brodifacoum, bromadiolone, difenacoum or difethialone to reduce the poisoning of non-target wildlife until the re-evaluation by the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) is completed; the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) also will play a consultation role in the re-evaluation.

The bill was in response to studies that showed the detectable levels of SGARs in wildlife had not declined despite a consumer ban of the products in 2014.

The pest control industry, including the National Pest Management Association (NPMA) and Pest Control Operators of California (PCOC), as well as other groups, had been working in opposition to AB 1788.

Chris Reardon, executive vice president of PCOC, said neither he nor PCOC members were surprised Newsom signed the bill into law,

but they were disappointed. “Fear and emotion overtook fact and science,” he told *PCT*.

AB 1788 includes numerous exemptions including wineries, breweries, warehouses, factories, agricultural sites, medical facilities, and drug and medical equipment manufacturing facilities, etc. Reardon and others contend that with these exemptions, AB 1788 really does *not* protect wildlife from SGARs as the bill’s sponsors touted. “Guess what: Places that are exempt, like wineries, are directly adjacent to wildlife. The sponsors got what they wanted, but the fact of the matter is this bill does nothing to protect wildlife,” Reardon said.

AB 1788 is expected to go into effect Jan. 1, 2021, but Reardon said the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) typically institutes a phase-out period for such matters. Reardon said he has been working with California Department of Pesticide Regulation to get clarity on how this implementation will take place. He added that the implementation could be challenging for CDPR because of the numerous exemptions/exceptions.

Reardon said California’s actions could have implications for the rest of the pest management industry. He said he would not be surprised if states such as Washington, Oregon and Massachusetts follow suit with similar bans. “For those states that think it could never be done, look at California,” he said.

(*PCT* Online September 30, 2020)  
<https://www.pctonline.com/article/california-governor-signs-rodenticide-ban-bill/>

## EPA'S DICAMBA TO-DO LIST

As the fall seed-buying season advances, EPA is facing a major time crunch on its dicamba herbicide decisions.

The agency had originally vowed to have a re-registration decision for four dicamba herbicides -- Tavium (Syngenta), Engenia (BASF), XtendiMax (Bayer) and FeXapan (Corteva) -- settled by early fall so farmers could buy their corresponding dicamba-tolerant seed with the certainty of in-season weed control options.

All four herbicides were set to expire in December 2020, but when a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' ruling vacated all but one of those herbicides, EPA's timeline was thrown into disarray. (See more here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

The agency is now in the process of reviewing new products and new registration applications for two of those herbicides -- Engenia and Xtendimax -- while also still doing its planned re-registration review of Tavium. (FeXapan is the same formulation as XtendiMax, so any future registrations of it depend upon a successful XtendiMax registration, Corteva has informed DTN.)

The situation has caused uncertainty for growers considering dicamba-tolerant seed purchases for use in 2021, prompting one company, Bayer, to offer a new "Plant with Confidence" program to offset that financial risk for farmers.

DTN caught up with these herbicide registrants to get the latest details on what is in front of EPA right now, as well as how Bayer's new program works.

### 1. XTENDIMAX + VOLATILITY-REDUCING AGENT

Bayer has submitted the same formulation of XtendiMax for registration and use in 2021, Bayer Dicamba Product Manager Alex Zenteno confirmed. The company also submitted a suite of data on the herbicide's performance and safety from

both internal and third-party testing in 2019 and 2020, she said.

Bayer is also submitting a new product for use with XtendiMax. The product doesn't have a brand name yet, but it is a volatility-reducing agent, Zenteno said. Bayer is working with multiple academic cooperators to test the new product, and they're also interested in any other research and products that address volatility reduction of dicamba, Zenteno said.

"Any product that would further improve the Xtend system, regardless of ownership, we are interested in," she said.

## 2. ENGENIA, ENGENIA PRIME AND SENTRIS

BASF is also submitting its previous formulation of Engenia for a new registration, along with its own new volatility-reducing spray additive called Sentriss, said Scott Kay, vice president of U.S. crop protection for BASF.

"It's a buffering agent that, when sprayed or tank mixed, will help to lower volatility and also help with pH," said Kay.

The company has also submitted a separate registration for a new pre-mix herbicide called Engenia Prime. It is a three-way mix of Engenia (dicamba -- Group 4), Zidua (pyroxasulfone -- Group 15) and Pursuit (imazethapyr -- Group 2).

"We're positioning it for early season weed control - preemergence to early post-emergence," Kay said. "We know farmers need to spray weeds when they are 4 inches or less in size." The product will have a cutoff date somewhere in early reproductive stages, he said.

## 3. TAVIUM WAITING ON RE-REGISTRATION

Syngenta's Tavium herbicide, labeled for use on dicamba-tolerant crops up through the V4 stage in soybeans and 6-leaf stage in cotton, is a premix of dicamba (Group 4) and s-metolachlor (Group 15).

Although Tavium is designed for use in dicamba-tolerant crops, its registration was separate from the three other over-the-top dicamba herbicides and was not immediately affected by the Ninth Circuit ruling.

The herbicide is set to expire on Dec. 20, 2020, and is under review by EPA for re-registration for 2021. (See the current label here: <http://www.cdms.net/...>)

"Syngenta is actively working with the EPA to get a timely re-registration of Tavium for the 2021 season," said Bobby Bachman, product marketing lead for soybean herbicides for Syngenta.

## 4. BAYER'S PLANT WITH CONFIDENCE PROGRAM

Bayer is marketing its RR2 Xtend soybeans for use in 2021, as well as XtendFlex cotton and soybeans, which tolerate dicamba, glyphosate and glufosinate (Liberty).

While the company is still waiting on a final import approval from the EU for the XtendFlex soybean trait, it is preparing for a commercial launch of the trait in 2021 of up to 20 million acres, roughly half the current footprint of Xtend soybeans in the U.S.

But without current labels for OTT dicamba herbicides, growers don't know whether they will be able to use dicamba on Xtend acres in 2021, Zenteno noted. So the company is offering to reimburse growers for the following seed purchases if XtendiMax or another over-the-top dicamba formulation is not available for use by Feb. 20, 2021:

-- \$7 per unit price reduction on RR2 Xtend soybeans.

-- \$3 per unit price reduction on XtendFlex soybeans (if they are commercially available for 2021).

-- \$40 per unit price reduction on XtendFlex cotton.

Not all seed brands are cooperating with this guarantee, so growers who are interested should consult Bayer's website for more details: <https://www.roundupreadyxtend.com/...>

(Progressive Farmer, September 24, 2020)  
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/09/24/dicamba-decision-time-epa-table>

## **INTERIM MEASURES FOR ATRAZINE COMPLETED**

EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler announced on Friday interim mitigation measures for atrazine and two related herbicides, propazine and simazine, during an agriculture event in Missouri.

Atrazine is widely used in agriculture across a range of crops, primarily corn but also sugarcane and sorghum, as well as a smaller amount of use in landscape care.

Specific mitigation measures were outlined in an EPA news release that coincided with Wheeler's public announcement. The new measures are designed to address potential human health and ecological risks.

The agency will require a reduction of the maximum application rate for atrazine and simazine when used on residential turf in order to protect children who crawl or play on treated grass.

EPA added a requirement for irrigation immediately after simazine application to residential turf and required additional personal protective equipment for workers who apply atrazine and simazine.

The agency is finalizing label requirements for all three triazines to include mandatory spray drift control measures, to minimize pesticide drift into non-target areas including water bodies, as well as updating label directions to reduce weed resistance to atrazine.

As part of its routine re-registration review of atrazine, EPA has been releasing draft ecological

and human health risk assessments for public comment.

New label language will prohibit spraying during a temperature inversion, set a 15-mph wind speed restriction for aerial and ground applications, as well as add specific boom and nozzle requirements.

The EPA also proposed ending one of two ongoing atrazine water-monitoring programs started in 2004.

Environmental groups have lobbied for atrazine to be banned entirely, based on concerns about human health risks and environmental problems, particularly concerning water quality.

Wheeler announced the measures at an agriculture roundtable in Springfield, Missouri, that included farmers and state and federal lawmakers.

"Today's decision is another example of the Trump administration taking action in support of America's farmers -- one of our strongest allies in our mission to protect public health and the environment," Wheeler said in the news release.

"The benefits of atrazine in agriculture are high, so these new protections give our nation's farmers more clarity and certainty concerning proper use."

EPA will next complete draft biological evaluations for atrazine. The evaluations are expected to be available for public comment later this fall.

Those evaluations are the first step in the interagency consultation process to protect listed species and their habitats in the Endangered Species Act. Final endangered species determinations are expected to be completed in 2021.

Look here for more information: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

(Progressive Farmer, September 18, 2020)  
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/09/18/epa-administrator-wheeler-announces>

# STATES BACK CHALLENGE OF US EPA INSECTICIDE APPROVAL

California, New York and eight other US states are backing a lawsuit filed by environmentalists challenging the EPA's approval of sulfoxaflor. They argue that the Agency had failed to fully consider the risks to bees and other pollinators from legal uses of the insecticide.

The states echo claims that the EPA has violated federal pesticide law and the Endangered Species Act (ESA), alleging that it has failed to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the registration. They also say that the Agency ignored its obligation to ensure that legal uses of the pesticide are not a risk to endangered species.

“Once again, the EPA has failed to comply with one of the most basic requirements of its job – providing notice and the opportunity for public comment before taking action,” said California Attorney General Xavier Becerra. “It's sadly unsurprising that the EPA approved the use of a toxic pesticide without a second thought for its effect on the environment or public health. We won't stand by while the EPA forsakes its mission in favor of jamming through an industry agenda.”

The other states joining California and New York are Hawaii, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Vermont and Washington.

## Seven-year dispute

The underlying lawsuit continues a legal battle over the EPA's approval of sulfoxaflor that stretches back to the Agency's 2013 [unconditional registration](#) for the insecticide.

That registration – granted to Dow AgroSciences (now Corteva Agriscience) – swiftly drew litigation from a coalition of environmentalists and [beekeepers](#) led by the Center for Food Safety (CFS). They argued that the EPA had classified the insecticide as "very highly toxic" to bees and

acknowledged that it lacked adequate data on the risks to pollinators.

The EPA and Dow argued that the Agency should have been shown deference to make its judgement about the risks and benefits of sulfoxaflor, but that a three-judge panel of the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit concluded EPA had simply failed to follow its own rules.

In its September 2015 ruling, the Court found that the EPA had relied on "flawed and limited" data when it issued the registration and failed to adequately assess the impacts on pollinators. The Court called on the EPA to obtain further studies and data regarding the effects of sulfoxaflor on bees, a decision that forced the Agency to [revoke](#) Dow's registration in November 2015.

The EPA granted an [amended approval](#) in October 2016 for uses on crops that are not attractive to bees, imposing buffer zones, a prohibition on tank mixing and other restrictions.

In [July 2019](#), the EPA issued another new registration, scrapping those mitigation measures and reinstating approvals for use on bee attractive crops – namely citrus, cotton, cucumbers, soybeans, butternut squash, strawberries and watermelons. The registration order also permitted new uses on several grains, including millet and oats, as well as on alfalfa, cacao, maize, pineapple, sorghum, and tree plantations.

Agency officials said that the benefits to growers far outweigh the risks, adding that more than a dozen new industry studies had found little potential harm to pollinators and no need for the past restrictions. New product labels include warnings declaring that the insecticide is "highly toxic to bees and other pollinating insects" and instructions to minimise drift, notify nearby beekeepers of planned applications and timing limits on when to spray.

The EPA also required additional restrictions on citrus, flowers and some fruits to further protect bees and other pollinators.

But the environmental groups were unconvinced and returned to the Ninth Circuit with another [lawsuit](#), alleging that the Agency had violated the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as well as the ESA.

### **Lack of comment**

The states say that they agree with the CFS-led coalition, arguing that the EPA issued the July 2019 registration without notice and an opportunity for the public to comment, which was in violation of the FIFRA.

“The lack of public input taints EPA’s registration decision,” the states say, noting that along with the registration decision, the EPA has released more than two dozen supporting documents that included summaries of the alleged benefits of the insecticide.

They argue that the EPA’s neglect to solicit feedback through public notice and comment “improperly skewed and limited” the registration to only Dow’s submissions.

“The dearth of varied perspectives is particularly problematic here because EPA’s registration decision was required to weigh sulfoxaflor’s benefits against its environmental harms,” according to the states. “EPA’s failure to provide notice and receive public comment for the challenged registrations thus guaranteed that its registration decision would rest on incomplete and one-sided information.”

The states add that the EPA has clearly ignored its obligation under the ESA to consult with federal wildlife officials. When it issued the new sulfoxaflor registration, the Agency said that it had not completed an effects determination for the insecticide as it was focused on assessing impacts on listed species from registered pesticides.

“But being busy is not an excuse to flout the law,” the states say in their September 3rd filing with the appeals court, adding that the Agency’s “unambiguous obligation” under the ESA is to

make an effects determination prior to registering a new pesticide.

”Thus, EPA’s registration of sulfoxaflor without conducting an ESA analysis is a clear violation of the ESA,” the states conclude, adding that the Agency’s “decision to register the challenged sulfoxaflor uses should be vacated”.

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, September 11, 2020)

## **USDA ARS SCIENTISTS WORKING TO BRING MORE WEAPONS TO FIGHT MOSQUITOES**

Scientists with USDA’s Agricultural Research Service (ARS) are working to bring more weapons to bear against one of the most dangerous creatures in the animal kingdom: the mosquito.

Mosquitoes spread diseases such as malaria, dengue, West Nile, yellow fever, and Zika, which affect millions of people around the world annually. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, severe cases of West Nile virus have increased in the United States by nearly 25% since 2008, and dengue has risen 300% worldwide in the past 30 years.

Chemical pesticide control measures help reduce the mosquito population, but according to Jose Luis Ramirez, a research entomologist at the ARS Crop Bioprotection unit in Peoria, IL, an integrated approach that adds cultural and biological methods is the best mitigation strategy.

Chemical pesticides can quickly control an insect pest population, but drawbacks include persistence in the environment and insecticide resistance from targeted insects. The advantages of microbial control include reducing chemical pesticide use, improving crop quality, and reducing environmental contamination.



“Mosquitoes transmit diseases to humans, pets, and livestock,” Ramirez said. “Non-chemical control offers an environmentally friendly alternative to reduce the impact of mosquitoes on animal health and the annual economic losses to U.S. agriculture.”

Ramirez and his colleagues are evaluating fungi and bacteria that already exist in nature and turning these mosquito-killing microbes into biopesticides that target mosquito eggs, larvae, and adults. The process is similar to combatting invasive plants by importing natural enemies from their homelands. Researchers identify beneficial microbes, test them for specificity against a target pest, then develop large-scale production for release against the pest.

Successful microbial biopesticides include *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *israelensis* (Bti), a pathogenic bacterium that produces protein crystals that break open the mosquito larval gut when ingested, and *Wolbachia*, a bacterium that interferes with the reproduction of the yellow fever mosquito, *Aedes aegypti*.

“Non-chemical strategies allow farmers to practice pest control over vast areas without environmental contamination and the detrimental effects on beneficial insects, such as pollinators, that are important for crop production,” Ramirez said.

Although it’s now late in the season, there are still plenty of things people can do to reduce mosquito infestation, and it’s not too early to start thinking about next year.

“We are moving towards the end of the mosquito season for most places in the United States,” Ramirez said. “However, removing mosquito breeding habitats will not only help this season, but also remove eggs that could overwinter and become the new generation of mosquitoes next year.

(PCT Online, September 8, 2020)  
<https://www.pctonline.com/article/usda-ars-mosquito-control-update/>

## ENLIST RULING APPEALED

The environmental groups that mounted -- and lost -- a legal challenge to EPA's Enlist Duo herbicide registration want another chance to argue their case in court.

In August, a panel of judges in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruled 2-to-1 in favor of Enlist Duo's continued registration, with the stipulation that EPA re-evaluate the chemical's risk to monarch butterflies.

See more here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

Late on Tuesday, the plaintiffs who brought the lawsuit against EPA, including the Center for Food Safety and The Center for Biological Diversity, filed a petition for a rehearing of that ruling "en banc," which means a review by a larger panel of 11 Ninth Circuit judges.

In their original lawsuit filed in 2017, these plaintiffs argued that the Ninth Circuit should vacate the registration of Enlist Duo, a 2,4-D-and-glyphosate premix herbicide designed for use over-the-top of Enlist crops. (The lawsuit did not address the Enlist One herbicide registration.) They alleged that EPA had not followed the proper procedures to assess risks to endangered species and the environment, as required by the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), when it registered the herbicide.

Now, in their petition for rehearing, the plaintiffs restated their original claims and argued the Ninth Circuit judges ignored established science showing the herbicide's risks overrode legal precedent and created a loophole for future pesticide registrations in their August ruling.

"The majority's decision cut a gaping hole in the ESA's heart," the petition concluded. "It creates perverse agency incentives to use models and data they know are scientifically unsound, and to determine endangered species' toxicity levels or mortality risks they believe appropriate, rather than

consult the expert agencies for 'any possible effect,' as required. And it will leave 500+ endangered species indisputably exposed to massive new use of toxic pesticides without any expert analysis of the true risk to them."

See the full petition for rehearing here: <https://www.dtn.com/...>

This petition is the plaintiffs' last chance to get the case overturned at the circuit court level. If their petition is denied, an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court is their sole remaining option. Corteva Agriscience, the current registrant of Enlist Duo, told DTN in an emailed statement that it is confident in the "sustainability and effectiveness" of the herbicide but is watching the case carefully. "We are monitoring the case while remaining focused on developing innovative products, such as the Enlist portfolio, that reflect our commitment to sustainability, farmer productivity and biodiversity," the statement said.

(Progressive Farmer, September 16, 2020)  
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/09/16/plaintiffs-ask-re-hearing-enlist-duo>

## **US EPA RECOMMENDS ACTION TO REDUCE NALED RISKS**

A US EPA review of the organophosphate insecticide, naled, has identified health and environmental risks, with a particular concern highlighted for children. Given that naled is a "critical tool" for controlling mosquitoes, the Agency is encouraging mosquito control districts to notify residents at least 24 hours prior to spraying. As part of the ongoing review, the EPA has issued draft human health and draft ecological risk assessments for naled for a public comment period ending on November 9th.

The Agency says that the draft assessment is "intentionally conservative", but it does show that estimated exposure from aerial application exceeds the EPA's level of concern for children aged 1-2 years for up to four hours following spraying. It has written to the American Mosquito Control Association to advise on how to modify aerial applications to protect residents. Providing recommendations at the draft stage of a registration review is "atypical", the EPA acknowledges. But it reflects the importance of naled in mosquito control.

EPA modelling shows that aerial application results in some deposition on the ground, and that reduction in ground deposition leads to lower exposure. The Agency recommends lower application rates, of 0.075 or 0.05 ai lb ai/acre (84 or 56 g ai/ha), in combination with smaller droplet sizes of 40-70 micrometres and applying at higher heights and higher wind speeds.

Naled and the insecticide, trichlorfon, degrade to form the insecticide, dichlorvos (DDVP), and so the EPA has also released draft risk assessments for trichlorfon and dichlorvos for public comment until November 9th.

Canada proposed in 2019 to cancel all uses of naled due to concerns over risks to human health and the environment. Its review of the ai was prompted by an EU decision in 2012 to prohibit all uses

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, September 10, 2020)

## CEU Meetings

None to report.

1

## ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

Online Pest Control Courses

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

PestED.com

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

Certified Training Institute

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

WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY  
EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

CEU University

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

Technical Learning College

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

All Star Pro Training

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

Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

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

CTN Educational Services Inc

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

Pest Network

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

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>

## **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/](http://www.psiexams.com/).

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

### PSI locations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd**

**Pesticide Safety  
Education Program**