

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



February, 2021

CHEM

- 1 TEST HELP WORKSHOP SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY IN OKLAHOMA CITY
- 2 COMMENT PERIOD EXTENDED FOR GLYPHOSATE DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION
- 2 EPA AUTHORIZES EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS FOR RESIDUAL ANTIVIRAL SURFACE COATING FOR OKLAHOMA AND ARKANSAS
- 3 EPA SEEKS PUBLIC INPUT ON THE CURRENT PESTICIDE EXEMPTION PROVISION PROCESS
- 3 BIDEN ORDERS US EPA TO REVIEW DECISION NOT TO BAN CHLORPYRIFOS
- 4 CHICAGO TAKES THE TOP SPOT ON ORKIN'S 2021 TOP 50 BED BUG CITIES LIST
- 6 COURT REJECTS EPA REVIEW ON SULFOXAFLOR
- 7 LAWSUIT CONTESTS US EPA DICAMBA APPROVALS
- 8 US EPA MULLS REVISIONS TO MINIMUM RISK PESTICIDE EXEMPTION RULES
- 9 DICAMBA SETTLEMENT CLAIMS PERIOD STARTS
- 10 CEU MEETINGS
- 11 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 11 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

TEST HELP WORKSHOP SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The Oklahoma State University Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has scheduled a test help workshop for February 18, 2021 in Oklahoma City. The workshop will be held at the Oklahoma County Extension Center at 2500 N.E. 63rd 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. Class information and an agenda can also be found at that website.
(OSU PSEP)

COMMENT PERIOD EXTENDED FOR GLYPHOSATE DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION

EPA is extending the public comment period on the draft biological evaluation for glyphosate to give stakeholders more time to review and comment. The current comment period was set to close on Jan. 26, 2021, and EPA is extending the comment period an additional 45 days. Comments can be submitted to docket number EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0585 on www.regulations.gov.

EPA will use feedback received from the public comment period to inform the final biological evaluation for glyphosate.

[View the draft biological evaluation and supporting documents.](#)

Background

In November 2020, EPA released its [draft biological evaluation \(BE\) for glyphosate](#) for public review and comment. Biological evaluations are the beginning of EPA's Endangered Species Act consultation review process where the agency determines whether a pesticide may affect one or more individuals of a listed species and their designated critical habitats. www.regulations.gov. (EPA January 12, 2021) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/comment-period-extended-glyphosate-draft-biological-evaluation>

EPA AUTHORIZES EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS FOR RESIDUAL ANTIVIRAL SURFACE COATING FOR OKLAHOMA AND ARKANSAS

Today, EPA announced emergency exemptions for the states of [Oklahoma and Arkansas](#) allowing them to permit the use of SurfaceWise2, a residual antiviral surface coating, in American Airlines airport facilities and planes. SurfaceWise2 is

already in use in American Airlines airport facilities and planes in certain locations in Texas under a previous [EPA emergency exemption](#).

EPA has also revised the terms of use for SurfaceWise2 for all emergency exemptions. EPA's initial emergency exemptions specified that the product remained effective for seven days. According to its updated labels, SurfaceWise2 provides residual surface control of the coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces that are undisturbed for up to 30 days. However, SurfaceWise2 should be reapplied every time surfaces are disinfected to ensure continuous product performance. Exposure to prolonged wetness may adversely impact the efficacy of the product.

SurfaceWise2 is meant to inactivate viruses that land on a surface between regular cleanings. This product is not a replacement for routine cleaning and disinfection with products from [EPA's List N: Disinfectants for Use Against SARS-CoV-2](#), the virus that causes COVID-19. EPA recommends that facilities continue to follow the cleaning and disinfection [recommendations](#) from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Use of this product does not eliminate the need for critical precautions like mask wearing, social distancing, and [ventilation](#). Always follow CDC, state and local public health guidelines. Please note that [according to the CDC](#), while "it may be possible that a person can get COVID-19 by touching a surface or object that has the virus on it and then touching their own mouth, nose, or possibly their eyes," the virus is thought to spread mainly through close contact between individuals.

For more information, see [EPA's website](#).

(EPA January 20, 2021) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-authorizes-emergency-exemptions-residual-antiviral-surface-coating-oklahoma-and>

EPA SEEKS PUBLIC INPUT ON THE CURRENT PESTICIDE EXEMPTION PROVISION PROCESS

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing an [Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking \(ANPRM\)](#) to solicit information on the current pesticide exemption provision process. EPA is considering whether regulatory and policy changes are needed to improve the exemption provisions for pesticides that may be considered minimum risk under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Changes to the current process could make the implementation and evaluation of the exemption provisions more efficient.

Specifically, EPA is seeking public input on:

- Whether programmatic changes are necessary to ease state regulation of federally exempt products; and
- Whether the agency should consider adding any new classes of pesticidal substances for exemption.

EPA is not yet proposing specific changes to FIFRA exemptions. The agency is only soliciting information that will help to determine if any changes in the regulations should be made.

Upon publication of the Federal Register notice, public comments will be accepted for 90 days in docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0537 at www.regulations.gov.

Background

EPA created the exemption for minimum risk pesticides in 1996 to reduce the cost and regulatory burdens on businesses and the public for pesticides posing little or no risk to human health and the environment.

For more information, view [minimum risk pesticides exempted from FIFRA registration](#).

For more information, view [minimum risk pesticide criteria](#).

(EPA January 19, 2021)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-seeks-public-input-current-pesticide-exemption-provision-process>

BIDEN ORDERS US EPA TO REVIEW DECISION NOT TO BAN CHLORPYRIFOS

US President Joe Biden has ordered the US EPA to re-examine its decision not to ban agricultural uses of the insecticide, chlorpyrifos.

The EPA was on course to revoke food tolerances and registrations for chlorpyrifos during the last days of former President Obama's administration in 2016 until ex-President Trump's officials intervened and abandoned the plan.

The call for the EPA to again reconsider the decision is one of many under the Trump administration that Mr. Biden is keen to reverse. It is part of the new administration's bid to closely look at all policies that "were harmful to public health, damaging to the environment, unsupported by the best available science, or otherwise not in the national interest".

The move will no doubt be welcomed by environmentalists and public health advocates who have sued the EPA to force it into banning chlorpyrifos. However, it may frustrate some agricultural interests who see the insecticide as a key crop protection tool and worry about the lack of effective and affordable alternatives.

Shifting policies

The EPA estimates that US farmers use some 5 million pounds (2,268 tons) of chlorpyrifos annually on more than 50 crops, including soybeans, alfalfa, almonds, apples, citrus, maize and strawberries.

The Agency has been considering a ban on chlorpyrifos since at least 2008 when the Natural Resources Defense Council and other environmentalists filed a petition warning that dietary exposures and the potential harm to children and farmworkers warranted pulling the insecticide from the market. Years of legal wrangling appeared over by 2015, when the EPA concluded that cumulative exposures had exceeded the safety standard under federal law and proposed revoking

tolerances, a move that would have effectively barred use on food crops.

But the Agency did not finalise the ban before the Trump administration took office and, in early 2017, then-EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt reversed course, declaring that the science surrounding potential health effects was uncertain and touting the benefits of the insecticide. Mr Pruitt said that the Agency would continue studying chlorpyrifos while leaving it on the market.

The decision prompted several states – California, Hawaii, Oregon and New York – to ban agricultural uses, while Democrats in Congress have introduced legislation to force the Agency to follow suit, pointing to growing momentum to abandon the insecticide.

The EU imposed a ban on chlorpyrifos in January 2020 and even some in the pesticide industry appear unconvinced it has much of a future. Shortly after the move by the EU, Corteva Agriscience – the major manufacturer of the insecticide – confirmed that it would cease production. The Trump administration, however, remained steadfast in support of keeping the pesticide available for US growers. The EPA formally denied the environmentalists’ petition in 2019. That is the decision that the Biden administration is calling on the Agency to review.

Risk assessment, reregistration plan under scrutiny
The review will no doubt impact a proposal by the Trump administration to re-register chlorpyrifos. The EPA in September 2020 issued a new risk assessment for the insecticide, highlighting uncertainty about the health risks and declaring that “despite several years of study, the science addressing neurodevelopmental effects remains unresolved.” Last month, the Agency issued a proposed re-registration decision for chlorpyrifos. The EPA is taking comments on that proposal, along with the new risk assessment, until February 5th.

Critics contend that the EPA ignored evidence that shows pre-natal exposure to levels far lower than those used by the Agency in its risk assessment can

cause permanent damage to children as well as lower birth weight, attention deficit disorder and reduced IQ.

A key issue is the EPA’s decision not to use data from a Columbia University study. That research has been swept up in controversy surrounding a Trump administration rule that limits the science that the EPA can use to only data that are publicly available and can be independently reproduced.

The Columbia University researchers refused to provide the EPA with the raw data from their studies, citing concerns about protecting the confidentiality of the women involved. But the Agency may change course on that given that the Biden administration has also blocked implementation of the “secret science” rule and called for it to be reviewed – and likely scrapped. (Connect AGRIBUSINESS, January 25, 2021)

CHICAGO TAKES THE TOP SPOT ON ORKIN’S 2021 TOP 50 BED BUG CITIES LIST

Chicago has a new gold medal as the #1 city on Orkin’s Top 50 Bed Bug Cities List, with Baltimore and Washington, D.C. trailing in second and third place. Despite less travel in 2020, bed bugs were still biting in Chicago, a popular hub for tourism. In fact, the Windy City usually welcomes more than 48 million visitors annually and boasts a transit system of buses and railways that carries 1.7 million passengers on any weekday¹ – a dream for bed bugs.

After joining the list last year, Toledo saw the biggest jump moving up 23 spots to number 27. Denver and Charleston both broke into the top 20, and six new cities joined the top 50 list for the first time this year.

The list is based on treatment data from the metro areas where Orkin performed the most bed bug treatments from December 1, 2019 –

November 30, 2020. The ranking includes both residential and commercial treatments.

1. Chicago (+2)
2. Baltimore
3. Washington, D.C. (-2)
4. Detroit (+3)
5. Columbus, OH
6. Cleveland, OH (+5)
7. Indianapolis (+2)
8. Cincinnati
9. Los Angeles (-5)
10. Grand Rapids (+8)
11. Charlotte (+9)
12. New York (-6)
13. Atlanta (-3)
14. Philadelphia (-2)
15. Champaign, IL (+1)
16. Dallas (+1)
17. Raleigh, NC (-3)
18. Charleston, WV (+8)
19. Pittsburgh
20. Denver (+7)
21. Flint (+7)
22. San Francisco (-9)
23. Greenville, SC (-9)
24. Norfolk (-9)
25. St. Louis (+3)
26. Richmond, VA (-5)
27. Toledo, OH (+23)
28. Dayton, OH (+21)
29. Buffalo, NY (-5)
30. Omaha (+2)
31. Nashville (-2)
32. Milwaukee (+1)
33. Fort Wayne, IN (+13)
34. Greensboro, NC (-9)
35. Cedar Rapids, IA (+6)
36. Knoxville, TN (-13)
37. Houston (+1)
38. Davenport, IA (-1)
39. Tampa (-5)
40. Youngstown (new to list)
41. South Bend (new to list)
42. Phoenix (+3)
43. Lexington (new to list)
44. Seattle (-1)
45. Orlando (-9)

- 46. Louisville (new to list)
- 47. Miami (-15)
- 48. Lansing (-18)
- 49. Peoria-Bloomington (new to list)
- 50. Minneapolis-St. Paul (new to list)

Typically, bed bugs are 3/16 inch long and are mostly nocturnal insects that come out of hiding to take blood meals from sleeping humans and are red to dark brown in color. Bed bugs are hematophagous, which means blood is their only food source. They can travel from place to place with ease, including items such as luggage, purses and other personal belongings.

“Bed bugs are a concern for everyone because they are master hitchhikers, traveling home with people when they likely don’t realize it,” said Ben Hottel, an Orkin entomologist. “Their nature of hiding in difficult-to-find cracks and crevices once introduced into a room can make them hard to control, which is why involving a trained professional at the sight of an introduction is recommended.” (PCT Online February 3, 2021)
<https://www.pctonline.com/article/chicago-tops-orkin-2021-top-bed-bug-cities-list/>

COURT REJECTS EPA REVIEW ON SULFOXAFLOR

EPA's request to conduct an Endangered Species Act review of the insecticide sulfoxaflor was rejected by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco, in a ruling handed down on Tuesday.

The agency was sued in 2019 by the Center for Food Safety and the Center for Biological Diversity for failing to conduct a review.

Sulfoxaflor is used to control piercing and sucking insects such as the sugarcane aphid in sorghum and the tarnished plant bug in cotton. The agency was ordered by a federal court in 2015 to vacate the sulfoxaflor registration because of a lack of data on its effects on bees.

In October 2020, EPA asked the court to allow it to correct acknowledged mistakes in the registration. The plaintiffs in the case objected to the agency's motion.

Part of the EPA motion would have allowed sulfoxaflor to remain in use while the agency conducted the review. The groups opposed the motion because they said in a court document they didn't trust EPA to conduct the review.

In a July 12, 2019, announcement, EPA said it had enough data to show sulfoxaflor is safe for humans and bees and had granted unconditional registration for new uses of sulfoxaflor on the Transform WG and Closer SC labels. The new uses are alfalfa, corn, cacao, grains (millet, oats), pineapple, sorghum, teff, teosinte and tree plantations. The agency also added back cotton, soybeans, citrus, cucurbits and strawberry.

The restrictions on the registrations granted in October 2016 were also removed.

In May 2016, the agency proposed a new label that excluded crops like cotton and sorghum and imposed spraying restrictions designed to minimize pollinators' exposure to the insecticide.

The Ninth Circuit vacated sulfoxaflor's registration in November 2015 because of pollinator concerns. The court cited a lack of data on possible harm to bees as the reason for ordering EPA to pull the registration.

EPA then asked Dow AgroSciences (now Corteva Agriscience) for more data on sulfoxaflor.

Bridgette Readell, market development specialist for Corteva Agriscience, said in a statement following the EPA announcement the approval was much needed.

EPA Assistant Administrator for Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention Alexandra Dapolito Dunn said during the announcement the agency relied on raw data from industry studies in reaching the decision.

Sulfoxaflor is safer than other insecticides because it requires fewer applications, Dunn said.

For years, states have petitioned EPA for emergency exemptions to be allowed to use sulfoxaflor.

In 2019 alone, Dunn said the agency has approved 12 state emergency requests for use in cotton and 14 in sorghum.

In making the decision, Dunn said the agency discovered many growers could see crop losses of 50% or higher without having sulfoxaflor available. Growers will still need to follow state regulations on the insecticide, she said.

(Progressive Farmer, January 13, 2021)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2021/01/13/epa-wanted-allow-insecticides-use>

LAWSUIT CONTESTS US EPA DICAMBA APPROVALS

A coalition of environmentalists and farmers has filed a second lawsuit challenging the US EPA's re-registration of dicamba herbicide for use on soybeans and cotton. It alleges that the Agency has violated federal law and ignored a court ruling that vacated prior registrations for the drift-prone herbicide.

The Center for Food Safety, Center for Biological Diversity, National Family Farm Coalition and Pesticide Action Network filed the lawsuit on December 23rd in the US District Court for the District of Arizona, claiming that the new registrations had failed to comply with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

The groups filed the suit a day after they filed a [similar complaint](#) with the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit – the move to file competing lawsuits is a jurisdictional one, preserving the plaintiffs' ability to pursue their legal challenge through either the district or appeals court.

“This is an administrative law case, about a federal agency stubbornly doubling down on a prior approval that the Ninth Circuit just held unlawful and vacated in June 2020,” the plaintiffs say in the district court complaint. “In its rush to re-approve this novel dicamba spraying again, EPA failed to follow the Court's order and more generally to comply with FIFRA's mandates. Instead, it tried to paper over the problems the Court found and in the process created new ones.”

New approvals, same problems

The EPA issued new five-year [registrations](#) for the products targeted by the lawsuit – Bayer/Monsanto's XtendiMax, BASF's Engenia and Syngenta's Tavium – in October, granting licence for the herbicides to be sprayed on dicamba-tolerant cotton and soybeans in 34 states. The Agency imposed new restrictions to try and mitigate drift concerns, including nationwide cut-off dates, increased buffer zones and use of a pH buffering agent to lower the volatility of the pesticides. The EPA's revisions to the label aim to limit the issues of volatilisation and drift that have sparked controversy over spraying of dicamba. Millions of acres of non-target soybeans and other crops have been damaged in the past three years by off-site movement of the potent herbicide.

But the plaintiffs contend that the registrations suffer from many of same shortcomings that had prompted a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit [to vacate](#) prior approvals of the dicamba products.

In a scathing decision issued in June, the panel found that the EPA had violated federal pesticide law as the Agency had “substantially understated the risks it acknowledged and failed entirely to acknowledge other risks” when it issued 2018 registrations that allowed the over-the-top uses of the dicamba products. The Ninth Circuit also concluded that the EPA had failed to consider and account for the social and economic costs from dicamba use and crafted a label that was nearly impossible for farmers and applicators to follow.

The plaintiffs contend that the new registrations “again either underestimate or ignore risks and costs to farmers and the environment from its decision” and rely on “an impossible label without analysing whether it can actually be followed in real-world conditions”.

Unrealistic requirements

The lawsuit notes that the prior registrations were “conditional” as the EPA has admitted that it lacked all the necessary studies on off-field drift and other issues that are required for an “unconditional” registration under the FIFRA.

The new registrations are “unconditional”, but the plaintiffs allege that the EPA has failed to meet the FIFRA standard to find legal uses that would not cause unreasonable adverse effects when used in accordance with the label.

“EPA’s byzantine, unrealistic use requirements for the products are not common practice nor do they permit farmers to use the product for its intended function effectively: to kill weeds, and still follow them,” the plaintiffs say. “To register a pesticide unconditionally, EPA must find that it can be sprayed and accomplish its intended purpose in the real world of farming, using common and accepted methods and still not cause unreasonable adverse effects, not according to whatever hypothetically EPA can think up to put on a label.”

The plaintiffs also contend that the Agency had failed to provide the APA-mandated notice and comment opportunity for a policy embedded in the registration decision that makes it nearly impossible for states to impose their own restrictions on use of the dicamba products. In past years, states have used a provision under FIFRA Section 24c to swiftly enact their own state-specific restrictions, such as cut-off dates and weather-related restrictions on use. But the new registrations make it clear that the EPA would not accept such moves – and not just for dicamba products.

“EPA now has declared for the first time that states can no longer use this authority and can only undertake any restrictive action using much more time-consuming measures, such as state legislative action or formal agency rulemaking,” the plaintiffs say. “This was a reversal of a decades-old rule.”

The EPA made the rule change without any notice and comment, “despite earlier promises that it would have notice and comment if it ever did alter states’ rights in this way”, according to the complaint.

The lawsuit asks the Court to vacate the registrations and hold that the EPA has violated the FIFRA and the APA. The plaintiffs say they also intend to amend their complaint to add claims that the Agency has violated the Endangered Species Act.

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, January 7, 2021)

US EPA MULLS REVISIONS TO MINIMUM RISK PESTICIDE EXEMPTION RULES

The US EPA is considering whether regulatory and policy changes are needed to improve rules that allow “minimum risk pesticides” to be exempt from registration rules under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Changes to the current process could make the

implementation and evaluation of the exemption provisions more efficient, the Agency says.

A 90-day [public comment](#) period has been opened. Comments are being sought on whether changes are necessary to “ease state regulation” of federally exempt products, and whether the EPA should consider adding any new classes of pesticidal substances for exemption. The Agency stresses that it is only seeking information at this stage and is not yet proposing specific changes to FIFRA exemptions.

The EPA is considering streamlining the petition process, in which companies apply for substances to be included in the list of ingredients allowed in exempted minimum risk pesticide products. It is also considering revisions to how it evaluates the potential minimum risk active and inert ingredients, factors used in classes of exemptions, state implementation of the minimum risk program and the need for any future exemptions or modifications to current exemptions.

“Minimum risk pesticides” are defined as chemicals that are exempt from registration requirements because their active ingredients and inerts pose little or no risk to human health or the environment. The exemption rules were last [revised](#) in 2015. Last October, the EPA proposed exemption for [chitosan](#), noting that it would represent the first substance added to the list in more than a decade.

(Connect AGRIBUSINESS, January 22, 2021)

DICAMBA SETTLEMENT CLAIMS PERIOD STARTS

Farmers who believe they had crops damaged from off-target dicamba from 2015 to 2020 can now submit claims at dicambasoybeansettlement.com/ or call 855-914-4672. The deadline to submit claims is May 28, 2021. The claims period began on December 29, 2020.

It’s part of a \$400 million settlement announced last June that’s designed to compensate farmers for yield losses resulting from off-target dicamba crop damage.

“We are pleased that relief will soon be available to the thousands of farmers across America who have suffered yield losses due to off-target movement of dicamba,” said attorney Don Downing, chair of the court-appointed plaintiffs’ executive committee in the multidistrict litigation.

Under the settlement, affected farmers may receive up to 100% of their yield losses caused by off-target dicamba. That means impacted farmers can potentially recover 100 cents on the dollar of the losses that they can establish with standard farming records. Farmers are able to complete the claim process on their own, hire an attorney of their choice, or retain one of the plaintiffs’ executive committee firms to assist with putting together the claim form and supporting documentation.

The settlement resolves the claims brought by a large group of farmers from several states whose dicamba injury lawsuits had been consolidated into a multidistrict litigation pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri and claims for the 2015-2020 crop years.

The settlement was negotiated by the court appointed plaintiffs’ executive committee: Don Downing of Gray Ritter & Graham, Rene Rocha of Morgan & Morgan, Paul Lesko of Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane & Conway, Hart Robinovitch of Zimmerman Reed, James Bilsborrow of Weitz & Luxenberg, Paul LLP, Bev Randles of Randles & Splittgerber, and Paul Byrd of Paul Byrd Law Firm.

(Successful Farming, December 20, 2020)

<https://www.agriculture.com/dicamba-settlement-claims-period-starts>

CEU Meetings

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

Date February 16, 2021

Title: Target Specialty TX & OK Winter Workshop 2021

Location: Virtual

Contact: Jennifer Gonzalez (800)-352-3870

<https://www.target-specialty.com/news-and-events/calendar/detail/993>

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

Date February 18, 2021

Title: Target Specialty TX & OK Winter Workshop 2021

Location: Virtual

Contact: Jennifer Gonzalez (800)-352-3870

<https://www.target-specialty.com/news-and-events/calendar/detail/995>

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	3A
2	10

Date February 18-19, 2021

Title: Nebraska Urban Pest Management Conference 2021

Location: Virtual

Contact: Jill-Morgan Aubert (703)-352-6762

<https://www.nspca.org/education-and-events/nebraska-urban-pest-management-conference-2021/>

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

Date September 7-9, 2021

Title: ENSYSTEX - 2021 CEU Workshop

Location: TBA

Contact: Don Stetler (281) 217-2965

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	7A
6	7B

ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

Online Pest Control Courses

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

PestED.com

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

Certified Training Institute

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

WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

CEU University

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

Technical Learning College

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

All Star Pro Training

www.allstarce.com

Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm

CTN Educational Services Inc

http://ctnedu.com/oklahoma_applicator_enroll.html

Pest Network

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

Veseris

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

AG CEU Online

<https://ageuonline.com/courses/state/37>

For more information and an updated list of CEU meetings, click on this link:

<http://www.kellysolutions.com/OK/applicators/courses/searchCourseTitle.asp>

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

Kevin Shelton 405-744-1060 kevin.shelton@okstate.edu or

Charles Luper 405-744-5808 charles.luper@okstate.edu

ODAFF Test Information

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

Testing will be done at testing centers in multiple locations around the state by PSI Services LLC.

For more information and instructions please go to <http://pested.okstate.edu/html/new-odaff-testing-procedure> or the PSI exam information website www.psiexams.com/.

Reservation must be made in advance at www.psiexams.com/ or call **855-579-4643**

PSI locations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Norman Moore Norman Technology Center, 4701 12th Ave NW, Norman, Oklahoma, 73070

Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd

**Pesticide Safety
Education Program**