

# PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



September, 2021

CHEM

- 1 UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTIONS SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER
- 2 EPA SUNSETS TEMPORARY GUIDANCE ON RESPIRATORY PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL PESTICIDE HANDLERS DURING COVID-19
- 2 EPA FINALIZES NEW, STRONGER SAFETY MEASURES FOR PESTICIDE PARAQUAT
- 3 EPA TO BAN AGRICULTURAL USE OF CHLORPYRIFOS
- 4 ASIAN LONGHORNED TICK CONFIRMED IN MISSOURI
- 4 GLYPHOSATE BATTLE RAGES
- 6 U.S. REGULATORY APPROVAL PREDICTABLE FOR BIOLOGICALS
- 7 ESA DISCONTINUES USE OF GYPSY MOTH, ANT NAMES
- 7 NEONICS AND ENDANGERED SPECIES
- 9 CEU MEETINGS
- 10 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 10 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION
- 11 Blackwell Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Flyer
- 12 Guymon Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Flyer

## UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSAL COLLECTIONS SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER

ODAFF has scheduled the next Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program collection dates for October 2021. They will occur October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021 in Blackwell and October 14<sup>th</sup> 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 SUNSETS TEMPORARY GUIDANCE ON RESPIRATORY PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL PESTICIDE HANDLERS DURING COVID-19

In June 2020, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued [temporary guidance](#) that offered flexibility during the COVID-19 public health emergency to agricultural employers and pesticide handlers regarding respiratory protection requirements related to pesticide uses covered by the Agricultural Worker Protection Standard (WPS). Due to improvements in access to NIOSH-approved respirators, fit testing supplies and related services, EPA is terminating the June 2020 guidance and its May 2021 [amendment](#), effective August 19, 2021.

EPA remains committed to protecting the health and safety of all communities, especially during the COVID-19 public health emergency. The decision to end flexibilities under the memoranda is in alignment with federal agency guidance issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration that entities should no longer use crisis capacity strategies for respirators and should promptly resume conventional practices.

To read the memorandum addressing this termination, please visit the [COVID-19 Enforcement and Compliance Resources](#) web page. To learn more about EPA's WPS, [click here](#).

(EPA, August 10, 2021)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-sunsets-temporary-guidance-respiratory-protection-agricultural-pesticide-handlers>

## EPA FINALIZES NEW, STRONGER SAFETY MEASURES FOR PESTICIDE PARAQUAT

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is releasing the interim decision (ID) for the pesticide paraquat dichloride (paraquat) finalizing new, stronger safety measures to reduce exposure. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (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. The ID is part of the legally required registration review process to identify risks as well as actions that can mitigate risks.

Paraquat is an herbicide applied annually to control invasive weeds and grasses in crops including cotton, corn, and soybeans. No direct one-to-one alternatives to paraquat are available. All paraquat products are [Restricted Use Products](#) and may only be used by certified pesticide applicators.

The agency has taken proactive steps to ensure paraquat is used in a manner that will not cause unreasonable adverse effects to human health or the environment and is consistent with the label directions. EPA's 2016 Paraquat Human Health Mitigation Decision included a [safety awareness campaign, targeted training for paraquat applicators](#), and [changes to labels and product packaging](#) to help prevent illness, injury, or death resulting from improper use.

The ID released today builds upon this previous work and includes the following enforceable mitigation measures that specify parameters for application and institute restrictions to further protect individuals from exposure. EPA has determined that these mitigation measures are necessary to address the risks identified from paraquat exposure while allowing for the continued use of this important agricultural tool.

- Limiting aerial applications and requiring residential buffers.
- Prohibiting pressurized handgun and backpack sprayer applications.
- Requiring enclosed cabs or respirators for groundboom applications.
- Increasing the Restricted Entry Interval (REI) for several crops.

Additionally, EPA evaluated hundreds of studies, including published toxicity and epidemiology literature on paraquat exposure and adverse health outcomes, including Parkinson’s Disease. There are many studies on paraquat and Parkinson’s Disease that range in quality and provide conflicting results. Following EPA’s 2019 literature [review](#), an [updated study](#) of the Agricultural Health Study cohort was published in 2020 that reported no association between paraquat exposure and Parkinson’s Disease. Notably, this updated study did not replicate [earlier 2011 findings from AHS](#) that were considered by EPA and suggested a potential association may exist. After a thorough review of the best available science, as required under FIFRA, EPA has not found a clear link between paraquat exposure from labeled uses and adverse health outcomes such as Parkinson’s disease and cancer.

The new safety measures announced today will significantly reduce potential human health risks and are protective of all potential human health outcomes, including Parkinson’s disease.

[More information about paraquat and the interim decision is available on EPA's website.](#)

(EPA, August 2, 2021)  
<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-finalizes-new-stronger-safety-measures-pesticide-paraquat>

## **EPA TO BAN AGRICULTURAL USE OF CHLORPYRIFOS**

Ending 14 years of regulatory and court battles, the [EPA announced](#) on Wednesday that it would ban agricultural use of the insecticide chlorpyrifos,

which has been linked to learning disorders and can cause nausea, dizziness, and confusion. Regulators ended residential use of the pesticide, which works by attacking the nervous systems of insects, two decades ago.

Developed by Dow, chlorpyrifos was approved by the EPA in 1965 and has since been used on a wide variety of crops, including corn, soybeans, cotton, vegetables, and fruit and nut trees. Corteva, created out of the merger of Dow and DuPont, said last year it would end production of the organophosphate pesticide, sold under the brand names Lorsban and Dursban, due to declining sales. Other companies continue to make it.

“Today EPA is taking an overdue step to protect public health,” said EPA administrator Michael Regan. “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.”

In a news release, the agency said that chlorpyrifos, by inhibiting an enzyme, can disrupt the nervous system and has been associated with potential neurological effects in children. The EPA said it will revoke its so-called tolerances for residues of chlorpyrifos on food and revoke registered food uses of chlorpyrifos associated with them.

Two environmental groups petitioned for an agricultural ban in 2007, setting off years of regulatory and judicial tussles. The EPA was moving toward eliminating the pesticide’s agricultural uses a few years ago, but the Trump administration reversed course. Earlier this year, the [U.S. appeals court in San Francisco](#) scolded the EPA for “13 years of interminable delay” and told it to promptly ban chlorpyrifos or set newer and safer exposure limits for it. “The court is itself being more than tolerant,” said the 2-1 decision. “But the EPA’s time is up.” California, Hawaii, New York, Maryland, and Oregon phased out use of the pesticide while the EPA was deciding what to do.

“Science has clearly shown that chlorpyrifos is too dangerous to be used to grow our food,” said senior scientist [Miriam Rotkin-Ellman](#) of the Natural Resources Defense Council, one of the groups that filed the 2007 petition. “The Trump EPA had allowed the continued use of this toxic pesticide, even though they knew it is damaging to human health — especially the developing brains of children.”

The EPA is conducting a registration review, required periodically by law, for chlorpyrifos, which has non-food uses. Some pesticides are available as alternatives to chlorpyrifos in agriculture, it said.

(Successful Farming, August 19, 2021)  
<https://www.agriculture.com/news/crops/epa-to-ban-agricultural-use-of-chlorpyrifos>

## **ASIAN LONGHORNED TICK CONFIRMED IN MISSOURI**

The Missouri Department of Agriculture, working in conjunction with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services and Missouri State University, has confirmed the first finding on an Asian longhorned tick (*Haemaphysalis longicornis*) in Missouri. Missouri is the 16th state with a presence of the tick species, following the first confirmed report of the Asian longhorned tick in the United States in 2017.

Asian longhorned ticks are light brown in color and are very small, often smaller than a sesame seed. Unlike other ticks, a single female Asian longhorned tick can produce offspring (as many as 1,000 at a time) without mating. That means individual animals could host thousands of ticks, which can cause great stress on a heavily infested animal.

The Department encourages producers to continue protective measures and to check their livestock regularly for ticks. Keeping grass and weeds trimmed and clearing away brush are important tick

prevention practices. If you spot any unusual looking ticks or large infestations on your animals, contact your local veterinarian.

According to the Center for Disease Control, the Asian longhorned tick appears to be less attracted to human skin. However, ticks of any kind should be removed immediately, as they can carry diseases that affect human health. Use EPA-approved insect repellent when you will be in or near tall grasses or wooded areas.

(PCT Online August 13, 2021)  
<https://www.pctonline.com/article/asian-longhorned-tick-confirmed-missouri/>

## **GLYPHOSATE BATTLE RAGES**

A single EPA document purported to show at least some agency officials expressed concern about a possible cancer link to the herbicide glyphosate is the subject of a battle playing out in federal appeals court on the main ingredient in Roundup.

Roundup garden and lawn care products are set to be pulled from shelves by 2023. Glyphosate received its most recent interim re-registration approval from EPA in 2020. Bayer announced earlier this year the action would not affect agriculture but was part of a plan to reduce the company's exposure to future Roundup lawsuits.

The groups suing the agency have argued in a series of reply briefs filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco that a 2016 internal EPA document should be made part of the record because it runs contrary to the agency's public decision. The agency declared glyphosate was safe and found no connection to non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

Attorneys for the EPA and Bayer have argued in their own reply briefs that the document was only part of internal deliberations and should not be included in the record.

EPA filed a motion in court to remand the agency's ecological assessment of the chemical that has been the subject of thousands of lawsuits across the country as an alleged cause of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (NHL) in Roundup users.

The 2016 EPA document shows agency officials were concerned about possible cancer connections.

"EPA conspicuously omitted a 2016 evaluation of epidemiological studies by its Office of Research and Development in which EPA scientists concluded there is 'suggestive evidence' of carcinogenic potential between glyphosate exposure and increased risk of NHL," the Rural Coalition, which includes Beyond Pesticides and the Center for Food Safety, said in its reply brief filed on Aug. 13, 2021.

"Just weeks ago, this buried EPA report surfaced for the first time. The ORD report considered and largely rejected various potential biases, confounding factors, and chance as explanations for increased NHL risk, factors EPA's pesticide division later used to discount epidemiological studies. But EPA's 2016 conclusion was that the 'weight of evidence is suggestive of carcinogenicity' and a 'concern for potential carcinogenic effects in humans is raised,' a classification joined by many SAP (EPA scientific advisory panel) members.

"At worst, this is bad faith by an agency with a long history of colluding with the industry it is supposed to regulate. At best, it shows EPA lacked substantial evidence for its cancer conclusion."

#### EPA RESPONDS

The EPA said in a brief filed in the Ninth Circuit on Aug. 20, 2021, the 2016 document was not made part of the official record because it was deliberative in nature.

"In Rural Coalition's opening brief, this manifested as attempts to direct the court to the minority opinion advanced by the International Agency for Research on Cancer, (or IARC) the preliminary

views of certain scientists from the Office of Research and Development, or the views of some members of the scientific advisory panel, while outright ignoring EPA's revised issue paper on cancer risk," the agency said in its brief.

In March 2015, the IARC classified glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans."

"Rural Coalition's motion to complete or supplement the record overlooks the glaring reason that the 2016 document they cite is not properly part of the record or before the court: it is a 'deliberative' document," EPA said.

"Such documents reflect an agency's internal, pre-decisional processes and are protected in order to ensure the proper function and integrity of the agency's decision-making."

Although Bayer has since announced plans to pull glyphosate-based Roundup from commercial shelves, the company said in a brief filed on Monday it stands by the science showing glyphosate is safe.

"EPA came to that conclusion following 10 years of extensive reviews of the scientific literature, convening panels of experts, issuing thousands of pages of findings, and involving the public through numerous rounds of notice and comment," Bayer said.

"Petitioners have not carried their burden to supplement the administrative record. Despite their allegations, they have provided no persuasive argument or evidence to establish that including the document is necessary to determine whether EPA considered all relevant factors, or because EPA relied on the document to reach its ultimate conclusions."

The Natural Resources Defense Council also filed a brief on Aug. 13, 2021, stating the group is not opposed to an EPA remand of the ecological assessment of glyphosate.

Rather, the NRDC argues the agency did not consider all public comments before finalizing its decision.

"EPA ignored NRDC's comments highlighting critical data gaps in the agency's assessment of glyphosate's human health risks," NRDC said in its brief.

"These gaps concern health risks for countless farmworkers and other herbicide users nationwide who are exposed to glyphosate products. EPA did not respond to these comments at all in the decision or in its responses to comments issued concurrently with the decision."

The agency first proposed an interim measure on glyphosate in April 2019 and accepted public comments until September 2019.

EPA reapproved an interim registration of glyphosate in January 2020. The Rural Coalition, Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Farmworker Association of Florida, Beyond Pesticides and the Center for Food Safety filed a petition for review in March 2020. Those groups asked a federal court to vacate the decision.

Most recently, EPA released a biological evaluation of glyphosate's potential effect on endangered species and critical habitats, finding it was "likely to adversely affect" 1,676 listed species and 759 critical habitats, the vast majority of the species and habitats the agency considered.

The agency's findings mean glyphosate will have to undergo more reviews before its routine registration review, initiated in 2009, can be completed, most likely sometime in 2021, according to EPA estimates on its website.

Agricultural crops genetically engineered to withstand glyphosate have greatly expanded use of the chemistry since 1996. Glyphosate also is used in forestry, urban, lawn and garden applications. Bayer also had glyphosate in its portfolio before acquiring Monsanto. (Progressive Farmer, August 26, 2021)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2021/08/25/epa-approved-glyphosate-despite-link>

## U.S. REGULATORY APPROVAL PREDICTABLE FOR BIOLOGICALS

Because of the characteristics of biological pesticides, new products are almost always guaranteed to receive regulatory approval in the United States within 18 months as long as all of the data and studies are provided, according to Paula Marcon, chief technology officer of AgBiTech.

"One good thing about the U.S. is it is very predictable, very organized, compared to other countries. U.S. regulators give an 18-month timeline for review, and if you supply all the documents and answer all their questions through the review process, you can be almost guaranteed you will have that registration in 18 months," Marcon said in an interview with *Southeast Farm Press*.

Marcon says it's a different story in Europe where regulatory approval can take up to six years, while in Brazil, regulatory approval tends to be faster than the United States.

AgBiTech is a Fort Worth-based crop protection company that manufactures biological insect management products.

Marcon said biological baculovirus-based insecticides are classified as a biochemical by the EPA, and there are waivers on some of the toxicological studies and requirements, but the regulatory timeline is the same as for chemical pesticides. She notes that baculovirus-based insecticides are recognized as a safe and natural insecticide and that EPA just wants to make sure that companies have a solid manufacturing process and that the formulations are safe in every batch.

As a biological insecticide used to control worms, baculovirus-based insecticides are sprayed in the

same rate and same manner as chemical insecticides.

“From that perspective, a grower doesn’t need to change his or her operation. The real change is understanding that you don’t want to wait until you have an acute problem to react. You need to react in an earlier stage, and you have to be more watchful,” Marcon said.

Marcon said baculovirus-based insecticides work mainly on the larval stages and are much more effective when the tiny caterpillars are coming out of the eggs. The challenge is that growers often wait until caterpillars are very large to make an application and the product works much slower and by then the caterpillars are causing a lot of damage and eating a lot more leaves.

Timeliness is critical, she emphasizes.

“These are the challenges. You need an understanding of the characteristics, the attributes, and the benefits of this new technology and how do you incorporate it into production systems,” she said.

(Southwest Farmpress August 16, 2021)  
<https://www.farmprogress.com/biotechnology/us-regulatory-approval-predictable-biologicals>

## **ESA DISCONTINUES USE OF GYPSY MOTH, ANT NAMES**

The [Entomological Society of America has removed “gypsy moth” and “gypsy ant”](#) as recognized common names for two insect species in its Common Names of Insects and Related Organisms List.

The changes are made in conjunction with the launch of a new ESA program to review and replace insect common names that may be inappropriate or offensive. Entomologists, scientists in related fields, and the public are invited to participate in identifying and proposing alternatives for insect

common names that perpetuate negative ethnic or racial stereotypes.

"The purpose of common names is to make communication easier between scientists and the public audiences they serve. By and large, ESA’s list of recognized insect common names succeeds in this regard, but names that are unwelcoming to marginalized communities run directly counter to that goal," says ESA President Michelle S. Smith, BCE. "That's why we're working to ensure all ESA-approved insect common names meet our standards for diversity, equity, and inclusion."

**Better Common Names Project**The Better Common Names Project seeks community input on ESA’s common names list and will direct the formation of working groups to develop and recommend new common names where needed. In March 2021, the ESA Governing Board approved new policies for acceptable insect common names, which bar names referencing ethnic or racial groups and names that might stoke fear; the policies also discourage geographic references, particularly for invasive species.

The existing common names for the moth *Lymantria dispar* and the ant *Aphaenogaster araneoides* were identified as containing a derogatory term for the Romani people. In June, the ESA Governing Board elected to remove the common names for both species from the ESA Common Names of Insects and Related Organisms List.

Native to Eurasia, *Lymantria dispar* is a serious pest of North American forests, with caterpillars that feed on more than 300 species of trees and shrubs. This year, parts of the northeastern U.S. and eastern Canada are seeing some of the largest outbreaks of *L. dispar* in decades. ESA will seek to convene a volunteer group to propose a new common name for *L. dispar*, which would then be made available for ESA member comment and subject to approval by the ESA Committee on Insect Common Names and the ESA Governing Board.

The ESA Common Names of Insects and Related Organisms List was created in the early 20th century and has grown to recognize common names for more than 2,300 insect and arthropod species. Only names that appear in the list may be used in articles published in ESA's scientific journals or in presentations and posters at ESA conferences, and ESA adheres to the list in all of its other communications, including its website, social media, and public policy documents. ESA makes the common names list available as a public resource, and a variety of scientific organizations, extension professionals, and media outlets refer to it.

For more info, see the [Better Common Names Project summary](#) and FAQs and the [Common Names of Insects and Related Organisms searchable database](#) and use and [submission guidelines](#). (PCT Online August 31, 2021) <https://www.pctonline.com/article/esa-discontinue-gypsy-moth-ant-names/>

## **NEONICS AND ENDANGERED SPECIES**

Three common neonicotinoid insecticides were ruled "likely to adversely affect" thousands of endangered species and critical habitats, according to draft biological evaluations released by EPA on Thursday, Aug. 26.

These findings could result in additional changes to the labels of the three neonicotinoid insecticides, if EPA decides they are necessary to protect these species and habitats after it consults with the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service in the months ahead. The products in question are imidacloprid (such as in Gaucho, from Bayer), clothianidin (such as in Poncho, from BASF) and thiamethoxam (such as in Cruiser, from Syngenta). These insecticides are also available from other companies.

All three are common ingredients in corn, soybean, wheat or cottonseed treatments, among other

agricultural uses. EPA had granted interim registration decisions for all three back in January 2020, but those registrations are not finalized until the agency has wrapped up these biological evaluations and decided if additional safety measures are required for their use.

All pesticides must go through these endangered species screenings, due to requirements in the Endangered Species Act, but EPA has only just begun to execute them. Most recently, the agency released its endangered species assessment for glyphosate, which found that the vast majority of species and habitats considered were at risk from glyphosate use. (see it here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>).

## **RECENT FINDINGS**

The EPA found that all three neonicotinoids were "likely to adversely affect" the majority of the endangered species and critical habitats the agency considered, with imidacloprid putting the most at risk. Plants, insects, and fish were among the most numerous species listed as threatened.

Here are the breakdowns:

--Clothianidin: 1,225 endangered species, 67% of those considered and 446 critical habitats, 56% of those considered.

--Imidacloprid: 1,445 endangered species, 79% of those considered and 658 critical habitats, 83% of those considered.

--Thiamethoxam: 1,396 endangered species, 77% of those considered and 644 critical habitats, 81% of those considered.

Note that these findings don't guarantee that label or use changes need to be made to protect those species or habitats.



"EPA must make an LAA [likely to adversely affect] finding if it finds any likely adverse effects - regardless of whether the effects may have broader implications for the species' conservation or recovery," the agency explained in a posted Q&A on its website. "For example, the likelihood of harm to even one bird of a species that exceeds 40,000 individuals is enough to trigger LAA. This is true even if the species' status is improving or near recovery."

#### WHAT LIES AHEAD

Now EPA will work with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to decide if additional changes need to be made to these insecticides' labels or registrations to protect any of the affected species.

"If the Services identify additional mitigation measures as part of formal consultation, they will include them in the biological opinions. Some of those measures may be tailored to the conservation needs of individual species, based on future discussions among EPA, the Services, and pesticide registrants," the agency wrote in its Q&A.

See the EPA's biological evaluation of:

--Clothianidin: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

--Imidacloprid: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

--Thiamethoxam: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

See more from DTN on the history of neonicotinoid use in seed treatments and the environmental concerns it has raised here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

#### 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 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

##### **Date September 16-17, 2021**

Title: 2021 OPMA Fall Conference

Location: Marriott Souther Hills, Tulsa

Contact: Eileen Imwalle (405)-726-8773

<https://www.ok-pca.com/conferences>

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	3A
1	6
5	7A
4	7B
3	8
9	10
1	13

##### **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

## ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

### Online Pest Control Courses

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

### PestED.com

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

### Certified Training Institute

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

### WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

### CEU University

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

### Technical Learning College

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

### All Star Pro Training

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

### Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

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

### CTN Educational Services Inc

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

### Pest Network

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

### Veseris

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

### AG CEU Online

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

### 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/](http://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](mailto:kevin.shelton@okstate.edu) or

Charles Luper

405-744-5808 [charles.luper@okstate.edu](mailto:charles.luper@okstate.edu)

Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd

**Pesticide Safety  
Education Program**



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**

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

### 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**

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

### **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](mailto:charles.luper@okstate.edu)

Ryan Williams  
Oklahoma Department of Agriculture  
Consumer Protection Services  
405.522.5993  
[ryan.williams@ag.ok.gov](mailto:ryan.williams@ag.ok.gov)

