

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



October, 2021

CHEM

- 1 UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTIONS OCTOBER 12 AND OCTOBER 14
- 2 EPA TAKES ACTION TO ADDRESS RISK FROM CHLORPYRIFOS AND PROTECT CHILDREN'S HEALTH
- 3 EPA ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR PET INCIDENT REPORTING AND RELEASES PROPOSED INTERIM DECISIONS FOR FOUR PESTICIDES
- 4 EPA TO SUNSET TEMPORARY DISINFECTANT SUPPLY CHAIN FLEXIBILITIES
- 5 UF/IFAS RESEARCHERS EXPLAIN SCIENCE BEHIND GENETICALLY MODIFIED MOSQUITOES
- 6 EPA EYES DICAMBA INJURY
- 8 POPULAR WEED KILLER COULD CAUSE BILLIONS IN CLAIMS
- 10 CEU MEETINGS
- 11 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 11 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION
- 12 Blackwell Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Flyer
- 13 Guymon Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Flyer

UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTIONS OCTOBER 12 AND OCTOBER 14

ODAFF has scheduled the next Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program collection dates for October 2021. They will occur October 12th, 2021 in Blackwell and October 14th in Guymon. The locations are the Blackwell Fairgrounds and Event Center and the Texas County Fairgrounds. The Disposal will run from 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. rain or shine at both locations.

There is no charge for this program. **Limit is 2,000 pounds per entity.** ONLY PESTICIDES will be taken at the sites (no fertilizer, paint, oil, etc)! If you have any questions, contact Charles Luper (OSU) at 405-744-5808 or Ryan Williams (ODAFF) at 405-522-5993.

October 12th Blackwell Fairgrounds
and Event Center
800 S. Main Blackwell, OK 74631

October 14th Texas County Fairgrounds
402 N Sunset Ln Guymon OK 73942

For more information, please go to
<https://extension.okstate.edu/programs/pesticide-safety-education/unwanted-pesticide-disposal-program/index.html>(OSU PSEP)

EPA TAKES ACTION TO ADDRESS RISK FROM CHLORPYRIFOS AND PROTECT CHILDREN'S HEALTH

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced it will stop the use of the pesticide chlorpyrifos on all food to better protect human health, particularly that of children and farmworkers.

In a final rule released today, EPA is revoking all “tolerances” for chlorpyrifos, which establish an amount of a pesticide that is allowed on food. In addition, the agency will issue a Notice of Intent to Cancel under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to cancel registered food uses of chlorpyrifos associated with the revoked tolerances.

“Today EPA is taking an overdue step to protect public health. Ending the use of chlorpyrifos on food will help to ensure children, farmworkers, and all people are protected from the potentially dangerous consequences of this pesticide,” **said Administrator Michael S. Regan**. “After the delays and denials of the prior administration, EPA will follow the science and put health and safety first.”

Chlorpyrifos is an organophosphate insecticide used for a large variety of agricultural uses, including soybeans, fruit and nut trees, broccoli, cauliflower, and other row crops, as well as non-food uses. It has been found to inhibit an enzyme, which leads to neurotoxicity, and has also been associated with potential neurological effects in children.

The steps the agency is announcing today respond to the [Ninth Circuit's order](#) directing EPA to issue a final rule in response to the 2007 petition filed by Pesticide Action Network North America and Natural Resources Defense Council. The petition

requested that EPA revoke all chlorpyrifos tolerances, or the maximum allowed residue levels in food, because those tolerances were not safe, in part due to the potential for neurodevelopmental effects in children.

Under the previous Administration, EPA denied the petition in 2017 and denied the subsequent objections in 2019. These denials were challenged in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2019 by a coalition of farmworker, health, environmental, and other groups. In April 2021, the Court found that “...EPA had abdicated its statutory duty under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act...” to “conclude, to the statutorily required standard of reasonable certainty, that the present tolerances caused no harm.” In its decision, the Court ordered EPA to grant the petition, issue a final rule in which the agency either modifies the chlorpyrifos tolerances with a supporting safety determination or revokes the tolerances, and modify or cancel food-use registrations of chlorpyrifos.

EPA has determined that the current aggregate exposures from use of chlorpyrifos do not meet the legally required safety standard that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from such exposures. A number of other countries, including the European Union and Canada, and some states including California, Hawaii, New York, Maryland, and Oregon have taken similar action to restrict the use of this pesticide on food.

While farmers have historically relied on chlorpyrifos, its use has been in decline due to restrictions at the state level and reduced production. Additionally, some alternatives have been registered in recent years for most crops. There are also other chemistries and insect growth regulators available for certain target pests. EPA is committed to reviewing replacements and alternatives to chlorpyrifos.

The U.S. has a safe and abundant food supply, and children and others should continue to eat a variety

of foods, as recommended by the federal government and nutritional experts. Washing and scrubbing fresh fruits and vegetables will help remove traces of bacteria, chemicals, and dirt from the surface. Very small amounts of pesticides that may remain in or on fruits, vegetables, grains, and other foods decrease considerably as crops are harvested, transported, exposed to light, washed, prepared, and cooked.

This action will also be incorporated into the ongoing registration review for chlorpyrifos. EPA is continuing to review the comments submitted on the chlorpyrifos [proposed interim decision](#), [draft revised human health risk assessment](#), and [draft ecological risk assessment](#). These documents are available in the chlorpyrifos registration review docket [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0850](#) at www.regulations.gov.

After considering public comments, the agency will proceed with registration review for the remaining non-food uses of chlorpyrifos by issuing the interim decision, which may consider additional measures to reduce human health and ecological risks. More information on the registration review process is available [here](#).

[More information about chlorpyrifos and the final tolerance rule is available on EPA's website](#) (EPA, August 18, 2021) <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-takes-action-address-risk-chlorpyrifos-and-protect-childrens-health>

EPA ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR PET INCIDENT REPORTING AND RELEASES PROPOSED INTERIM DECISIONS FOR FOUR PESTICIDES

The U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing its plan collect pet incident data on four pesticides used in a variety of agricultural and non-

agricultural settings, including in residential pet products. These pesticides are MGK-264, piperonyl butoxide (PBO), pyrethrins, and amitraz.

In its overall efforts to protect pets under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), EPA intends to request enhanced incident reporting and sales data for these pet products to align with what is already submitted for spot-on products. These data would allow the agency to conduct a comparative assessment of pet incidents across registered pet products based on sales data to better determine whether any changes to the pet product registrations and labels are necessary. EPA is interested in feedback from stakeholders on the most efficient way these data can be provided to the agency and types of analyses that could be submitted to expedite the agency's assessment. EPA is also considering additional measures that could enhance its oversight of pet products, such as additional targeted studies and monitoring, and welcomes public comments on these and other potential measures.

Additionally, EPA is releasing proposed interim decisions (PIDs) for MGK-264, PBO, and pyrethrins to address potential human health and ecological risks. EPA is also releasing the PID for amitraz. FIFRA requires the agency to periodically re-evaluate pesticides through registration review to ensure that risk assessments and pesticide decisions reflect the best available science. Registration review is a multi-step process to identify risks as well as actions that can mitigate risks.

Based on the findings in the draft human health and ecological risk assessments and feedback submitted during the public comment periods, EPA is proposing the following mitigation measures for MGK-264, PBO, and pyrethrins:

- Additional personal protection equipment for several occupational handler scenarios;

- Prohibiting certain applications via indoor dusters, shakers, aerosol space sprays, handheld/portable misters and foggers, and liquid spray applications;
- Adding mandatory spray drift management label language (PBO and pyrethrins only); and
- Cancelling multiple products/uses for certain residential, commercial (e.g. food handling establishments, warehouses) and indoor agricultural use (e.g., poultry houses, animal quarters).

For amitraz, the agency did not identify any human health risks of concern. Additionally, the agency has concluded that, although the potential ecological risks are limited only to honey bees in hives treated with amitraz, the risks are low and has, therefore, made a “no effect” determination for species groups for amitraz products under the Endangered Species Act. EPA is not proposing any risk mitigation for amitraz.

Upon publication of Federal Register notice, public comments will be accepted for 60 days in the registration review dockets, [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0415](#) (MGK-264), [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0498](#) (PBO), [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0885](#) (pyrethrins) and [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-1015](#) (amitraz) at www.regulations.gov.

After a thorough review of the science and carefully considering scientific peer review and public comments, EPA will proceed with the registration review process for MGK-264, PBO, pyrethrins, and amitraz. The next step in the FIFRA registration review process is the interim decision, which imposes risk mitigation measures necessary to protect human health and the environment.

Background on Pesticide Uses

Pyrethrins are a mix of six compounds used as insecticides to target a wide range of pests in agricultural and non-agricultural settings. Pyrethrins are also registered for use in residential pet products, such as pet shampoos, pet spot-ons, and pet dusts.

MGK-264 and PBO are insecticide synergists used in combination with a variety of insecticides such as the pyrethrins and pyrethroids. Synergists are chemicals that, while lacking pesticidal properties of their own, enhance the pesticidal properties of other active ingredients. The use patterns for PBO are similar to the pyrethrins. MGK-264 has similar indoor commercial and indoor residential uses, but has no agricultural crop uses. Outdoor uses of MGK-264 are limited to building surface treatments. Both MGK-264 and PBO are registered for use in residential pet products, such as pet shampoos, pet spot-ons, and pet dusts.

Amitraz is an insecticide/acaricide currently registered for use in pet collars for control of ticks on dogs and in impregnated strips for control of Varroa mites in beehives

(EPA, August 3, 2021)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-announces-plan-pet-incident-reporting-and-releases-proposed-interim-decisions-four>

EPA TO SUNSET TEMPORARY DISINFECTANT SUPPLY CHAIN FLEXIBILITIES

In 2020, EPA introduced regulatory flexibilities to ensure that critical antimicrobial products remained available as the country responded to the COVID-19 public health emergency. As supply chains have stabilized and [disinfectant products expected to kill SARS-CoV-2](#) (the virus that causes COVID-19) have become consistently available to consumers, the agency has determined that this flexibility is no longer needed.

EPA will terminate the Temporary Amendment to Pesticide Registration (PR) Notice 98-10, effective September 15, 2022. Acknowledging that registrants have made changes in their supply chains and may require time to adjust their contractual commitments, EPA is providing 12

months' notice before the termination takes effect. Registrants must ensure that by September 15, 2022, their product is produced using a source of active ingredient identified in the product's approved confidential statement of formula or otherwise complies with the requirements of PR Notice 98-10.

To read the memorandum addressing this termination, see EPA's [PR Notice 98-10 webpage](#).

Background

On March 30, 2020, EPA issued a Temporary Amendment to PR Notice 98-10. This time-limited modification allowed registrants of products on EPA's [List N: Disinfectants for Coronavirus \(COVID-19\)](#) to switch suppliers of certain active ingredients by notification without waiting for EPA's approval.

On April 14, 2020, EPA issued a revised Temporary Amendment to PR Notice 98-10 in response to additional reports of supply chain disruptions by pesticide registrants who manufacture disinfectants for use against SARS-CoV-2. Several of the provisions also applied to pesticide products that serve as the source of active ingredients in List N disinfectants.

On May 11, 2020, EPA issued another revised Temporary Amendment in response to reports of shortages of sanitizers used in the production and manufacture of foods like grains, cereal, flour, and industrial baked goods. This time-limited modification extended the flexibility detailed in the April amendment to food-contact surface sanitizer products containing the active ingredient isopropyl alcohol. (EPA September 15, 2021) <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-sunset-temporary-disinfectant-supply-chain-flexibilities>

UF/IFAS RESEARCHERS EXPLAIN SCIENCE BEHIND GENETICALLY MODIFIED MOSQUITOES

South Florida residents seeking science-based information about genetically modified mosquitoes can access a new, online resource from University of Florida scientists at the [UF/IFAS Florida Medical Entomology Laboratory](#).

“[Genetically Modified Mosquitoes](#)” is the latest publication on Ask IFAS, UF/IFAS' Electronic Data Information Source (EDIS) peer-reviewed site, that provides relevant information regarding the pilot projects in select areas of the Florida Keys. The experiments, which are a collaboration between the Florida Keys Mosquito Control District and the biotechnology company Oxitec founded in the United Kingdom out of Oxford University, are permitted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The UF/IFAS publication describes the mosquito species being targeted, what to expect from the pilot projects, why this approach is being used as well as answers to other frequently asked questions about genetically modified mosquitoes. The publication also lists additional linked resources for readers interested in more detailed information on the topic and science.

“The rationale for producing this document is to help inform the public and those who are interested or impacted by the current trials run by Oxitec,” said Eric Caragata, an assistant professor at UF/IFAS FMEL. “As scientists who are not directly involved in the project, we wanted to clearly address some of the important questions and concerns.”

With the initial launch of one of the pilot projects in spring 2021, residents, businesses and visitors expressed public concerns about the biology of genetically modified mosquitoes, and the purpose and expected outcomes of their experimental use in the fight against mosquito-transmitted diseases. In their publication, UF/IFAS scientists weigh in and clarify the basic

science, the projects, and provide readers with additional resources.

“We are in a battle to control mosquitoes and the pathogens they spread, with millions of people becoming infected each year,” said Caragata. “Genetically modified mosquitoes are one of many new tools that could help get rid of mosquito populations before they continue to spread diseases.”

Aedes aegypti, also known as the dengue or yellow fever mosquito, is a biting pest and the species most responsible for transmitting dengue, chikungunya, yellow fever, and Zika viruses to humans. It is an invasive pest considered a major threat to human health in many areas of the world where the mosquito species and at least one of the viruses it transmits co-occur. Established in many areas of Florida, including the Florida Keys, it has led to dengue, chikungunya and Zika causing local outbreaks that resulted in 190, 12, and 300 human cases, respectively, over the past 15 years. Almost all of those cases have occurred in southern Florida.

The publication’s authors hope readers will gain a new understanding of why it is important to test these newer mosquito control approaches.

Traditional control methods aren’t always effective against this highly dangerous mosquito, said Yoosook Lee, a co-author and assistant professor of molecular ecology at UF/IFAS FMEL. “Biotechnology methods, like what Oxitec developed, can provide much needed solutions to break through insecticide resistance and hard to reach areas using conventional control methods.”

The document clarifies and details what genetic modifications have been made to the mosquitoes released to reduce the survival of the species, adds co-author Eva Buckner, an assistant professor and medical entomology UF/IFAS Extension specialist at the UF/IFAS Research and Education Center in Vero Beach. It also provides information on successful experiments of this technology in other parts of the world.

For example, genetically modified *Aedes aegypti* male mosquitoes were released in one city in Brazil for six weeks in 2012, explains Buckner.

“Brazil is the country with the highest number of dengue human cases and economic burden. The releases reduced the local *Aedes aegypti* population in that city by 95 percent,” said Buckner. “It is believed that the reduction in the mosquito population could have been large enough to prevent a dengue epidemic in the Brazilian city while the releases were taking place.”

As mosquitoes become more resistant to insecticides and expand their range due to globalization and environment change, UF/IFAS scientists and Florida’s mosquito control programs continue to address and seek research opportunities that are in the best interest of the environment, wildlife and human health.

(PCT Online September 1, 2021)

<https://www.pctonline.com/article/uf-researchers-explain-science-behind-genetically-modified-mosquitoes/>

EPA EYES DICAMBA INJURY

EPA is actively reviewing how the new dicamba labels performed this summer and is alarmed at the levels of injury reports surfacing from some states, EPA Deputy Press Secretary Tim Carroll told DTN in an email.

The review could prompt label changes, if necessary, Carroll wrote.

"EPA is extremely concerned about these reports and is taking steps to better understand the nature and severity of these incidents in order to assess the sufficiency of the mitigations in the 2020 decision and, as necessary, take appropriate regulatory action," he said.

In search of a clearer picture, the agency sent letters on Sept. 9 to Bayer, BASF, Syngenta and Corteva, demanding that they turn over more information on dicamba injury reports from the 2021 season. The letters

suggest EPA believes companies are withholding certain reports, such as damage to seed production and research fields, or cupped soybean fields that companies believe should be attributed to other causes.

The agency also is communicating with the Weed Science Society of America, state Extension agents, academics, the Association of American Pesticide Officials and USDA about off-target dicamba movement this summer, Carroll said. "EPA encourages others with relevant information to provide it to the Agency," he concluded.

For more information on how dicamba injury has continued this summer, see this DTN story: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

Agrichemical companies are required by the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) to report "adverse effects" such as drift and crop injury from their pesticides to EPA promptly. Companies with over-the-top dicamba herbicide registrations, such as Bayer (XtendiMax), BASF (Engenia) and Syngenta (Tavium) face enhanced requirements on dicamba injury reporting and studies. (Corteva, which discontinued its FeXapan dicamba product this year, was also included by EPA in this group, because the herbicide's registration is still active with EPA).

In the letters sent to the four companies, EPA suggests companies may have withheld some key dicamba injury incidents --which are due within 30 days of a report -- and research.

Specifically, the agency's letters suggest companies may have not reported injury from dicamba to their seed and research fields.

"The Agency has received reports of seed breeding programs and research plots being impacted by exposure to dicamba," each letter stated. "EPA has not received such reports from your company."

The letters also mention allegations that companies are ignoring reports of cupped soybeans if the company investigators believe another source is the problem, such as drought or soybean genetics. (See a DTN story on the

in-season debate on the causes of soybean cupping this summer here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

"EPA has received allegations that some registrants have not submitted reports of leaf 'cupping' of soybean plants on the grounds that cupping can be caused by drought and/or exposure to herbicides other than dicamba (e.g, glufosinate, group 15 herbicides) in certain varieties that are of 'poor plant genetics,'" the letters state. "EPA considers this assertion speculative, and insufficient grounds to rule out dicamba exposure as a cause of cupping. Accordingly, leaf cupping is considered an adverse effect of dicamba exposure and must be reported irrespective of plant genetics, although genetic information considered relevant may be included in the report."

The agency is demanding a long list of information from companies related to dicamba injury or off-target effects, including:

- All studies or incidents on adverse effects of dicamba.
- Any information on plant sensitivity to dicamba, especially plants more sensitive to it than soybeans.
- Annual total quantities of all dicamba products sold by each registrant.
- Any reports of seed or research fields exposed to dicamba.
- All reports of "cupping" in soybean plants.
- Information on the herbicidal and toxicological effects of dicamba.
- Any information on tank mixes found to be incompatible or reactive. (See a related DTN story here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)
- Any information stemming from pending or anticipated lawsuits over dicamba injury.
- All studies or data on dicamba off-target movement, volatilization, spray drift, runoff, leaching, rainfall, as well as studies on dicamba residues in rainwater, and the

development of dicamba-resistant weeds. (See a related DTN story here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

You can see the letters here: <https://www.regulations.gov/...>

Bayer sent a statement to DTN on Sept. 10, which characterized the letters as a routine part of a herbicide registration and did not address the alleged missing studies and dicamba injury incidents: "Bayer routinely provides information to EPA relative to our product registrations, and well after EPA approval," the statement said. "This is a matter both of EPA's routine regulatory oversight, and also in the spirit of ongoing cooperation."

BASF emailed a statement on Sept. 14, saying that the company was already complying with the letters' directives. "As required by law, BASF has submitted to the EPA monthly 6(a)(2) reports of alleged adverse incidents reported to BASF where Engenia herbicide was alleged to have caused injury to neighboring crops or property," the statement read. "We intend to fully comply with the EPA's request and will continue to work with growers, governmental agencies, and weed scientists to provide timely, accurate, and complete information to these important stakeholders."

As of publication time, Syngenta had not yet responded to DTN's requests for comment.

(Progressive Farmer, September 14, 2021)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2021/09/10/epa-search-dicamba-injury-reports>

POPULAR WEED KILLER COULD CAUSE BILLIONS IN CLAIMS

Yet another popular weed killer used by American farmers for decades is becoming a costly liability for the companies behind the chemical.

Over the past seven months, new lawsuits have been filed almost every day claiming farmers or field workers contracted [Parkinson's disease](#) from their exposure to Paraquat, a highly toxic herbicide developed by Syngenta AG and sold in the U.S. by Chevron Corp.

The surge in complaints comes as another company, Bayer AG, has set aside as much as \$16 billion to resolve thousands of current cases and prepare for future suits tied to Roundup, the best-selling U.S. weed killer. While it's still early days in the Paraquat litigation, personal-injury lawyers are blanketing radio, television and social media with ads seeking new clients who could demand billions of dollars in compensation.

"Even if there aren't the kind of Roundup-level number of cases, I can see these companies offering several billion dollars just to make it go away," [Richard Ausness](#), a University of Kentucky law professor who specializes in product-liability cases, said of the Paraquat lawsuits. "Parkinson's disease has a long, expensive tail that will drive up the cost of settling these cases."

Syngenta has already started settling. The company [disclosed](#) in August that it agreed on June 1 to pay \$187.5 million to resolve an undisclosed number of cases "solely for the purpose of bringing to an end these claims."

What Bloomberg Intelligence says

"Syngenta's statement that it settled certain cases for \$187 million in June could mean top-end exposure totals billions of dollars." -- Holly Froum, Litigation Analyst.

Paraquat has been used on many U.S. crops since the 1960s, but it's banned in more than 30 other countries over alleged ties to Parkinson's, a brain disorder that leads to shaking, stiffness and balance problems. In the U.S., the chemical must be sprayed by a licensed applicator.

At the start of 2021, only a handful of lawsuits over Paraquat were making their way through state and federal courts in the U.S. Since February, there have been more than 400 new complaints filed in federal courts alone.

Thousands more are possible after a court panel in June consolidated all federal cases under a judge in Illinois, and the success of the Roundup litigation created an incentive for plaintiffs' lawyers to find more Paraquat clients. Attorney [Michael Miller](#), who sued Chevron and Syngenta, said there may eventually be as many as 35,000 cases.

Disputing claims

The companies have steadfastly disputed the claims Paraquat causes the nervous-system disorder.

“There is no credible evidence Paraquat, which has been widely used for more than 55 years, causes Parkinson's disease,” said Saswato Das, a spokesman for Switzerland-based Syngenta. “No peer-reviewed study, including the largest study which involved 38,000 farmers, has ever concluded Paraquat causes Parkinson's disease.”

Syngenta was acquired in 2017 for \$43 billion by China National Chemical Corp., which combined it with other seed and fertilizer businesses. ChemChina disclosed in July it was seeking to raise \$10 billion (65 billion yuan) in a Shanghai listing of shares that represent a 20% stake in Syngenta.

Chevron spokesman Tyler Kruzich said in an email the company didn't believe it caused the plaintiffs' injuries and “will vigorously defend against the allegations.”

The number of Paraquat lawsuits isn't likely to be anywhere near as many as the claims against Bayer and Roundup, which is widely used by American farmers, landscapers and home gardeners. The global market for glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup, may reach \$13.3 billion in 2027, according to estimates from researcher [Reports and Data](#).

Paraquat's market share is much smaller -- estimated by [360 Research Reports](#) at about \$100 million last year -- because it can only be used under a license. It's mostly sprayed on corn, soybean and cotton fields, Syngenta says on its [website](#).

Paraquat pot

Paraquat also has been used in the long war on drugs. From about 1975 to 1978, the U.S. sought to reduce the flow of marijuana from Mexico, the biggest supplier at the time, by encouraging defoliation techniques the American military used during the Vietnam War. The U.S. spent about \$30 million a year to aid Mexico's spraying of Paraquat on the illegal crops, according to the [American Journal of Public Health](#). A few years later, government agencies proposed spraying Paraquat on pot farms in California and Florida.

The litigation against Roundup “has set a massive precedent,” [Garry Mabon](#), an analyst and founding partner at Scotland-based researcher [AgbioInvestor](#), said in an email. But a key difference between the chemicals is that Paraquat is well understood as being a possible carcinogen, while the key ingredient in Roundup isn't, he said. “As such, the weight of evidence would seem to be against Paraquat in any litigation.”

The lawsuits were assigned to U.S. District Judge Nancy Rosenstengel in East St. Louis, Illinois, because the state's farmers are among the biggest Paraquat users and Rosenstengel already had 20 cases before her. The first trial of those cases is set for late next year. Suits also are being filed in state courts, including California and Illinois, according to Miller, the plaintiffs' attorney.

Rosenstengel, appointed by President [Barak Obama](#) in 2014, will manage pre-trial information exchanges and test trials. It's her first time overseeing a so-called [multi-district litigation](#). “Its my job to bring this case in for a landing, whether that be trials or settlement,” Rosenstengel said at the initial status hearing in June. She didn't respond to requests for additional comment.

The case is In Re: Paraquat Products Liability Litigation v. Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC, 21-md-3004, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois (East St. Louis)

(Southwest Farmpress September 13, 2021)
<https://www.farmprogress.com/herbicide/popular-weed-killer-could-cause-billions-claims>

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: October 6-7, 2021

Title: 2021 Fall OKVMA Conference
Location: Hard Rock Casino Catoosa OK
Contact: Kathy Markham (918)-256-9302
<https://okvma.com/conferences/>

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

Date: October 25-26, 2021

Title: Kansas Agricultural Aviation Association Convention
Location: Kansas Star Casino Mulvane KS
Contact: Rhonda McCurry (316) 650-6857
<https://www.ksagaviation.org/kaaa-annual-meeting-and-convention/>

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

Date: October 28-29, 2021

Title: OK GROWS 2021
Location: Stoney Creek Hotel Broken Arrow OK
Contact: Summer Maser (405) 945-6737
<https://www.tickettailor.com/events/oklahomanurse-ryandlandscapeassociation/553605>

CEU's:	Category(s):
4	3A
1	3B
2	3C
4	10

Date: November 1-3, 2021

Title: 2021 Ag Expo
Location: Embassy Suites Norman OK
Contact: Tammy Miller (580)-233-9516
<https://www.oklahomaag.com/>

CEU's:	Category(s):
TBA	1A
TBA	7C
TBA	10

Date: November 9, 2021

Title: Grower CEU Meeting
Location: Caddo Kiowa Technology Center Fort Cobb OK
Contact: Keith Brownback (405) 643-3280

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

ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

Online Pest Control Courses

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

PestED.com

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

Certified Training Institute

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

WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

CEU University

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

Technical Learning College

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

All Star Pro Training

www.allstarce.com

Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

www.nachi.org/wdocourse.htm

CTN Educational Services Inc

http://ctnedu.com/oklahoma_applicator_enroll.html

Pest Network

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

Veseris

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

AG CEU Online

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

Target Specialty Products Online Training

<https://www.target-specialty.com/training/online-training>

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

For more information and instructions, please go to <https://bit.ly/3sF4y0x>.

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

PSI locations.

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

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

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

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

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

Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd



PESTICIDE SAFETY
EDUCATION PROGRAM
OSU Extension

Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program

<https://bit.ly/3pF9K2p>



October 2021

When & Where?

8:00 am to 1:00 pm

DATE	October 12, 2021
COUNTY	Kay County
CITY	Blackwell
LOCATION	Blackwell Fairgrounds and Event Center, 800 S. Main Blackwell, OK 74631

What is the Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal program?

The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry is funding a program to help collect and properly dispose of unwanted pesticides that homeowners, farmers, ranchers, commercial applicators, or dealers may have. For future locations and dates check the website listed above.

What are unwanted pesticides?

Unwanted pesticides are pesticides that are unusable as originally intended for various reasons. Unwanted pesticides are leftover pesticides, pesticides that are no longer registered in the state of Oklahoma, pesticides that no longer have labels and pesticides that are no longer identifiable.

Who is eligible to participate and what does it cost?

Oklahoma commercial and non-commercial applicators and pesticide dealers may participate. Oklahoma farmers and ranchers and homeowners can use the program as well. **There is no cost for the first 2,000 pounds of pesticides brought in by a participant.**

- Liquid pesticide weighs about 10 pounds per gallon.

Will someone pick up my pesticides for me?

No it is the owner's responsibility to transport the pesticides to the site. Some transportation tips can be found at <https://bit.ly/3pF9K2p>

What are the steps to participate in the collection program?

Applicators, homeowners, farmers, and ranchers are not required to pre-register. Dealers are asked to voluntarily pre-register through the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program. After completing pre-registration requirements, if required, bring unwanted pesticides safely to one of the collection sites.

Why are dealers asked to pre-register?

Dealers are asked to pre-register due to the potential of large quantities coming from multiple dealers and/or multiple locations. This allows the contractor to plan the appropriate resources to handle the quantity of pesticides that comes into the collections. Visit the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program for information and how to register at <https://bit.ly/3pF9K2p>

Will the department use my participation in the program as a means to prosecute for illegal management of pesticides?

No, the disposal program is a service program designed to remove unusable pesticides from storage and reduce the potential threat to public health and the environment. Those disposing of pesticides will not be required to provide their names or details on their chemicals. The disposal service is free up to 2,000 pounds.

Contact Information:



PESTICIDE SAFETY
EDUCATION PROGRAM
OSU Extension

Charles Luper
Oklahoma State University
Pesticide Safety Education Program
405.744.5808
charles.luper@okstate.edu

Ryan Williams
Oklahoma Department of Agriculture
Consumer Protection Services
405.522.5993
ryan.williams@ag.ok.gov





Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program



<https://bit.ly/3pF9K2p>

October 2021

When & Where?

8:00 am to 1:00 pm

DATE	October 14, 2021
COUNTY	Texas County
CITY	Guymon
LOCATION	Texas County Fairgrounds, 402 N Sunset Ln Guymon OK 73942

What is the Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal program?

The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry is funding a program to help collect and properly dispose of unwanted pesticides that homeowners, farmers, ranchers, commercial applicators, or dealers may have. For future locations and dates check the website listed above.

What are unwanted pesticides?

Unwanted pesticides are pesticides that are unusable as originally intended for various reasons. Unwanted pesticides are leftover pesticides, pesticides that are no longer registered in the state of Oklahoma, pesticides that no longer have labels and pesticides that are no longer identifiable.

Who is eligible to participate and what does it cost?

Oklahoma commercial and non-commercial applicators and pesticide dealers may participate. Oklahoma farmers and ranchers and homeowners can use the program as well. **There is no cost for the first 2,000 pounds of pesticides brought in by a participant.**

- Liquid pesticide weighs about 10 pounds per gallon.

Will someone pick up my pesticides for me?

No it is the owner's responsibility to transport the pesticides to the site. Some transportation tips can be found at <https://bit.ly/3pF9K2p>

What are the steps to participate in the collection program?

Applicators, homeowners, farmers, and ranchers are not required to pre-register. Dealers are asked to voluntarily pre-register through the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program. After completing pre-registration requirements, if required, bring unwanted pesticides safely to one of the collection sites.

Why are dealers asked to pre-register?

Dealers are asked to pre-register due to the potential of large quantities coming from multiple dealers and/or multiple locations. This allows the contractor to plan the appropriate resources to handle the quantity of pesticides that comes into the collections. Visit the OSU Pesticide Safety Education Program for information and how to register at <https://bit.ly/3pF9K2p>

Will the department use my participation in the program as a means to prosecute for illegal management of pesticides?

No, the disposal program is a service program designed to remove unusable pesticides from storage and reduce the potential threat to public health and the environment. Those disposing of pesticides will not be required to provide their names or details on their chemicals. The disposal service is free up to 2,000 pounds.

Contact Information:



Charles Luper
 Oklahoma State University
 Pesticide Safety Education Program
 405.744.5808
charles.luper@okstate.edu

Ryan Williams
 Oklahoma Department of Agriculture
 Consumer Protection Services
 405.522.5993
ryan.williams@ag.ok.gov

