

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



January, 2021

CHEM

- 1 PRACTICAL SCHOOL DATES FOR 2021
- 2 EPA PROPOSES NEW SAFETY MEASURES FOR CHLORPYRIFOS
- 2 COMMENT PERIOD EXTENDED FOR ATRAZINE, PROPAZINE AND SIMAZINE DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS
- 3 EPA INCREASES TRANSPARENCY FOR INERT INGREDIENTS IN ANTIMICROBIAL PRODUCTS
- 3 TEXAS A&M PROJECT FOCUSES ON GENETIC ENGINEERING TO CONTROL MOSQUITOES
- 5 NEW DICAMBA LAWSUIT
- 6 STATES CHALLENGE US EPA REVISIONS TO FARMWORKER SAFETY RULE
- 7 NEW 2,4-D AND DICAMBA DATA
- 10 US EPA MULLS SETTLEMENT OVER AGCHEM ASSESSMENT LAWSUITS
- 11 CEU MEETINGS
- 12 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 12 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

PRACTICAL SCHOOL DATES FOR 2021

Practical school dates for 7A, 7B, and 7C categories have been scheduled for the first half of 2021. Applicators in these categories must attend the school and pass one final exam to get certified in these categories.

With COVID-19 precautions class size is limited to 50% of capacity. Extra dates have been added to the normal schedule to compensate for the reduced size.

Cost is \$200 for 7A and 7C classes and \$350 for the 7B class.

Please enroll online at this website
<https://extension.okstate.edu/programs/pesticide-safety-education/practical-workshop-and-re-certification-dates/>

7A	7B	7C
		January 14
February 9		
March 16	March 17-18	
April 13		April 15
May 18	May 19-20	

(OSU PSEP)

EPA PROPOSES NEW SAFETY MEASURES FOR CHLORPYRIFOS

EPA is taking the next step in its regulatory review of chlorpyrifos, an insecticide used for a large variety of agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses. Today, EPA is proposing measures to reduce the risks identified in the agency's September 2020 draft risk assessments to better protect human health and the environment. As outlined in the proposed interim decision (PID), EPA is proposing:

Label amendments limiting application to address potential drinking water risks of concern.

Additional personal protection equipment and application restrictions to address potential occupational handler risks of concern.

Spray drift mitigation, in combination with the use limitations and application restrictions identified to address drinking water and occupational risks, to reduce exposure to non-target organisms.

The PID presents proposed mitigation with the 10-fold (10X) Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) Safety Factor, reflecting the uncertainties around doses that may cause pre- and post-natal neurodevelopmental effects. Under FQPA, EPA evaluates new and existing pesticides to ensure they can be used with a reasonable certainty of no harm to infants, children, and adults. EPA is required to consider the special susceptibility of children to pesticides by using an additional 10X safety factor unless adequate data are available to support a different factor. EPA additionally included a FQPA factor of 1X to reflect the range of potential risk estimates of chlorpyrifos, as illustrated in the September 2020 draft risk assessments.

Upon publication of the PID in the Federal Register, public comments will be accepted for 60 days on both the September 2020 draft risk assessments as well as the PID. By holding the comment period for both of the actions at the same time, the public has access to more information and can provide more informed, robust comments.

EPA will also consider the input and recommendations from the September 2020 FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) meeting once it releases its report 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 next steps in the registration review process for chlorpyrifos.

Read the PID here. Upon publication of the Federal Register notice, public comments will be accepted for 60 days in the chlorpyrifos registration review docket # EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0850 at www.regulations.gov. (EPA December 4, 2020) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-proposes-new-safety-measures-chlorpyrifos>

COMMENT PERIOD EXTENDED FOR ATRAZINE, PROPAZINE AND SIMAZINE DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS

EPA is extending the public comment period on the draft biological evaluations for atrazine, propazine and simazine to give stakeholders more time to review and comment. The current comment period was set to close on Jan. 5, 2021, and EPA is extending the comment period an additional 45 days. Comments can be submitted to docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0514 on www.regulations.gov.

EPA will use feedback received from the public comment period to inform the final biological evaluations.

View the draft biological evaluations and supporting documents.

Background

In November 2020 EPA released its draft biological evaluations for atrazine, propazine and simazine 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. (EPA December 23, 2020) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/comment-period-extended-atrazine-propazine-and-simazine-draft-biological-evaluations>

EPA INCREASES TRANSPARENCY FOR INERT INGREDIENTS IN ANTIMICROBIAL PRODUCTS

In support of the Trump Administration’s ongoing commitment to increase transparency and at the request of retailers, states, and industry, EPA is allowing registrants of antimicrobial pesticide products to more efficiently disclose inert ingredients. Through today’s action, consumers will be able to view inert ingredients for certain products by following a QR code or website link included on a product’s label.

An inert ingredient is any substance other than an active ingredient that is intentionally included in a pesticide product. Inert ingredients play a key role in the effectiveness of a pesticidal product. For example, in some instances, inert ingredients are added to extend the product's shelf-life. The term “inert” does not imply that the chemical is nontoxic.

Websites referenced on product labels are considered labeling under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. In these cases, companies must self-certify that the information provided on the website is consistent with their latest Confidential Statement of Formula.

Currently, the scope of this policy is limited to antimicrobial pesticide products. The agency may consider expanding to conventional pesticide and biopesticide products in the future.

For more information, please visit EPA’s website.

Background

Disclosure of inert ingredients is voluntary. There is no statutory or regulatory requirement at the federal level to identify inert ingredients except where it has been required on a case-by-case basis. In such cases, the guidelines for voluntary inert ingredient disclosure do not apply. (EPA December 10, 2020) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-increases-transparency-inert-ingredients-antimicrobial-products>

TEXAS A&M PROJECT FOCUSES ON GENETIC ENGINEERING TO CONTROL MOSQUITOES

To control mosquito populations and prevent them from transmitting diseases such as malaria, many researchers are pursuing strategies in mosquito genetic engineering. A new Texas A&M AgriLife Research project aims to enable temporary “test runs” of proposed genetic changes in mosquitoes, after which the changes remove themselves from the mosquitoes’ genetic code.

The project’s first results were published on Dec. 28 in Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, titled “Making gene drive biodegradable.”

Zach Adelman, Ph.D, and Kevin Myles, Ph.D., both professors in the Texas A&M College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Department of Entomology are the principal investigators.

Over five years, the team will receive \$3.9 million in funding from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases to test and fine-tune the self-deleting gene technology.

“People are wary of transgenes spreading in the environment in an uncontrolled manner. We feel that ours is a strategy to potentially prevent that from happening,” Adelman said. “The idea is, can we program a transgene to remove itself? Then, the gene won’t persist in the environment.

“What it really comes down to is, how do you test a gene drive in a real-world scenario?” he added. “What if a problem emerges? We think ours is one possible way to be able to do risk assessment and field testing.”

A crucial target for mosquito control

Many genetic engineering proposals revolve around inserting into mosquitoes a select set of new genes along with a “gene drive.” A gene drive is a genetic component that forces the new genes to spread in the population.

“A number of high-profile publications have talked about using a gene drive to control mosquitoes, either to change them so they can’t transmit malaria parasites anymore, or to kill off all the females so the population dies out,” Adelman said.

An often-voiced worry is that such genetic changes could carry unintended or harmful consequences.

One plan makes the cut

In the project’s first publication, the colleagues describe three ways for an introduced genetic change to remove itself after a designated period of time. The time period could, for instance, be 20 generations of mosquitoes, or

about a year. The team modeled how the genes would spread among mosquitoes based on generation times and parameters of an average mosquito’s life. Of the three methods, the team has chosen one to pursue further.

This method takes advantage of a process all animals use to repair damaged DNA, Adelman said. Inside cell nuclei, repair enzymes search for repeated genetic sequences around broken DNA strands. The repair enzymes then delete what’s between the repeats, he said.

So, Adelman and Myles’ team plans to test in fruit flies and mosquitoes a gene drive, a DNA-cutting enzyme and a small repeat of the insect’s own DNA.

Once the introduced enzyme cuts the DNA, the insect’s own repair tools should jump into action. The repair tools will cut out the genes for the gene drive and the other added sequences. At least, that’s what should happen in theory.

Failure is not just an option, it’s part of the plan

The team has already started lab work to test different gene drives and determine how long they last in flies and mosquitoes. The goal is to see a gene drive spread rapidly through a lab insect population. After a few generations, the added genes should disappear and the population should again consist of wild-type individuals.

“We assigned various rates of failure for how often the mechanism does not work as expected,” Adelman said. “The models predict that even with a very high rate of failure, if it succeeds just 5% of the time, that’s still enough to get rid of the transgene.” (PCT Online January 5, 2021) <https://www.pctonline.com/article/texas-am-mosquito-control-genetic-engineering/>

NEW DICAMBA LAWSUIT

In what is becoming a familiar cycle, a group of environmental and farm groups have filed a lawsuit challenging EPA's latest round of dicamba herbicide registrations.

The lawsuit was filed by the same groups whose lawsuit against the 2018 dicamba registrations ended in a federal court vacating three dicamba registrations on June 3 of this year. See more here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

The plaintiffs in that lawsuit -- National Family Farm Coalition, Center for Food Safety, Center for Biological Diversity and Pesticide Action Network - had vowed to challenge the EPA's new 2020 registrations of XtendiMax (Bayer), Engenia (BASF) and Tavium (Syngenta) after they were announced in late October.

Now they have followed through, with a five-page filing in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco, the same court that oversaw their earlier lawsuit as well.

The new dicamba lawsuit echoes the plaintiffs' past successful lawsuit against EPA in many ways. As in that older lawsuit, the plaintiffs argue that EPA broke its governing law, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) when it granted unconditional five-year registrations for three dicamba herbicides by failing to prove the new registrations pose "no unreasonable adverse effects on the environment." And once again, the new lawsuit alleges that EPA violated the Endangered Species Act (ESA) by not consulting with the required federal agencies to ensure the new registrations wouldn't harm any endangered species or critical habitats -- a charge the court declined to consider in the past lawsuit.

But the new lawsuit also challenges EPA's sudden decision to disallow states' use of Section 24(c) special local need labels to further restrict the federal dicamba labels without "holding notice and comment on the decision," as the agency had

promised states it would do. (See more here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>).

Ultimately, the new lawsuit asks the Ninth Circuit to vacate the 2020 dicamba registrations and "craft equitable ... relief to prohibit any continued use of existing, already sold pesticide products," a callback to the EPA's decision to allow farmers and applicators to use existing stocks of dicamba after the court vacated the 2018 registrations back in June. Finally, the new lawsuit asks the court to find that EPA's unilateral decision to end restrictive 24(c) labels violates the Administrative Procedure Act and provide relief.

Two of the dicamba registrants whose products are implicated in the lawsuit -- Bayer and Syngenta -- told DTN they are reviewing the filing. Bayer's statement also stressed that the company does not believe the lawsuit will affect farmers' access to its XtendiMax herbicide in 2021.

"We are reviewing the filing, which has no immediate impact on our ability to bring XtendiMax to growers this season or on growers' ability to use XtendiMax this season," Bayer said in an emailed statement. "We look forward to bringing XtendiMax to growers and helping them have a successful 2021 season and beyond."

See the filing here: <https://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/...>

(Progressive Farmer, December 22, 2020)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/12/22/enviro-groups-sue-epa-new-dicamba>

STATES CHALLENGE US EPA REVISIONS TO FARMWORKER SAFETY RULE

California, New York and three other US states are challenging the Trump administration's revisions to an EPA farmworker safety rule. They allege that the changes have illegally weakened protections for farmworkers and the public.

The rule in question revamps a provision of the Worker Protection Standard (WPS) called the Application Exclusion Zone (AEZ), which effectively creates a buffer zone around pesticide application equipment and requires the area to be free of all individuals except the applicator when a pesticide is being applied.

When finalized in 2015, the WPS set the AEZ at 25 feet (7.6 m) in all directions for ground pesticide applications when sprayed from a height of more than 12 inches (30 cm) and 100 feet in all directions for all other kinds of outdoor aerial pesticide applications.

The revisions, finalized in late October, left those standards in place but narrowed the rest of the AEZ language to make it "easier to ensure people near our nation's farms are protected, while simultaneously enhancing the workability of these provisions for farm owners and protecting the environment", according to EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler.

Under the new rule, the AEZ requirements only apply within boundaries of the agricultural establishment, a change called for by state regulators who were worried about enforcing the provision.

Farm owners and their immediate family members are now exempt from all aspects of the AEZ requirements and can shelter inside closed buildings during pesticide applications. The EPA added clarifying language so that pesticide applications that are suspended because of individuals entering an AEZ may be resumed after they have left the

area. It also simplified criteria to determine whether applications are subject to the 25- or 100-ft AEZ.

Worry about increased risks

While the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture and other ag interests welcome the changes, states say that the EPA is ignoring risks to public health from pesticides.

"Day in and day out, agricultural workers are exposed to increased health risks as essential workers during the Covid-19 pandemic," said California Attorney General Xavier Becerra. "The Trump Administration's decision to undercut existing public health protections for these workers is not only reprehensible – it's illegal. We're going to court to prove it."

Illinois, Maryland and Minnesota have filed the suit along with California and New York, alleging that the EPA had "departed from the Agency's recent prior position without adequate justification or factual support".

Filed in the US District Court for the Southern District of New York, the complaint questions the EPA's analysis of the costs and benefits of the new rule and alleges that it has failed to provide a "reasonable and adequate explanation" for the changes as required by the Administrative Procedure Act.

In addition to harming workers and potentially members of the public near treated fields, the states say that they will face "an increased enforcement burden" against pesticide exposure because they will no longer be able to refer AEZ violations to EPA and "will bear the full enforcement burden of ensuring compliance with more protective standards".

The states add that they will have to expend "greater enforcement resources because the Final Rule makes it more difficult to determine whether pesticide contact has occurred after a farmworker falls ill."

“States will need to take samples and often get a medical diagnosis from a doctor for any ailments stemming from pesticide exposure, which can be difficult to determine,” states the complaint. “These processes will cost plaintiffs extra time, money, and resources.” (Connect AGRIBUSINESS, January 4, 2021)

NEW 2,4-D AND DICAMBA DATA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE FIRST STIRRINGS OF CHANGE

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

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

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

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

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

EPA DROPS ITS DECISION -- SORT OF

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

While EPA's stance might be supported by the language of the law, the longstanding, published

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

"This is still totally up in the air," he added.

"There's no guidance on what happens to restrictive 24(c) labels that are in effect right now -- is this a blanket invalidation of them all?"

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

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

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

STATE REGULATORS REACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The policy change could force some states not to register federally registered pesticides if they have

any local ecological or public health concerns, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation told DTN in an email.

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

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

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

LOOKING AHEAD

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

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

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

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

(Progressive Farmer, December 7, 2020)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2020/12/07/four-things-missouri-scientists-2-4>

US EPA MULLS SETTLEMENT OVER AGCHEM ASSESSMENT LAWSUITS

The US EPA is seeking public comments on a proposed out-of-court settlement on lawsuits alleging that it failed to adequately assess the potential harm of four active ingredients on endangered species. The settlement relates to lawsuits brought by US environmental group Center for Biological Diversity in 2015 and 2016 on approvals of: ChemChina subsidiary Syngenta's herbicide, bicyclopyrone, and its fungicide, benzovindiflupyr (trade-marked as Solatenol); Bayer's Crop Science division's insecticide, flupyradifurone; and Corteva legacy company Dow AgroSciences' herbicide, halauxifen-methyl (trade-marked as Arylex).

Under the proposed settlement, the parties, which include the ai registrants, will ask the court to order the EPA to complete final biological evaluations on two of the ais by September 30th 2025 and the remaining two by September 30th 2027. These dates could be extended if specific events occur, such as the extension of a comment period.

The EPA should initiate consultations with the National Marine Fisheries Service and/or the Fish and Wildlife Service as appropriate, based on the outcome of the evaluations. Within three months of it issuing draft biological evaluations or no later than December 2024 and December 2026, the parties would meet and discuss potential interim measures.

Public comments on the proposed settlement are requested by January 14th 2021.

The lawsuits represent a long-running dispute over compliance with the US Endangered Species Act. Since 2012, the EPA, the wildlife agencies and the USDA have been trying to implement recommendations to improve the assessment process. The EPA is required to consult wildlife agencies, but few consultations have been completed because of disagreements over assessments. This has resulted in numerous legal challenges by environmentalist groups against pesticide approvals and frustration for the industry over delayed procedures. (Connect AGRIBUSINESS, December 29, 2020)

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: January 18-19, 2021

Title: OAAA

Location: Virtual

Contact: Sandy Wells (405) 431-0381

sandy@okaaa.org

CEU's:	Category(s):
4	A
5	1A
1	2
1	3A
1	4
2	5
2	6
1	8
7	10

Date: January 20, 2021

Title: Red River Crops Conference

Location: Virtual

Contact: Gary Strickland (580) 477-7962

<https://www.eventbrite.com/e/red-river-crops-conference-tickets-131490516675>

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

Date: February 24, 2021 **CANCELED**

Title: 2021 Vesperis Annual CEU Workshop Training

Location: **Canceled**

Contact: Deb Chambers (918) 630-3222

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

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

Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd

**Pesticide Safety
Education Program**