

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



January, 2022

CHEM

- 1 TEST HELP WORKSHOPS SCHEDULED FOR 2022
- 2 EPA RELEASES SUMMARY OF DICAMBA-RELATED INCIDENT REPORTS FROM THE 2021 GROWING SEASON
- 3 EPA EXTENDS EXPIRATION DEADLINE FOR PESTICIDE APPLICATOR CERTIFICATION PLANS
- 4 EPA SUED OVER SEED TREATMENTS
- 5 NEW UF STUDY: KILLING THE BROOD KEY TO ELIMINATING TERMITE COLONIES
- 6 SUPREME COURT TO ASK BIDEN'S INPUT IN BID TO END BAYER ROUNDUP LAWSUIT
- 8 AG FERGUSON: AMAZON WILL PAY \$2.5 MILLION OVER ILLEGAL SALES OF REGULATED PESTICIDES
- 10 CEU MEETINGS
- 10 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 11 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

TEST HELP WORKSHOPS SCHEDULED FOR 2022

The Oklahoma State University Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has scheduled a test help workshops for January 28 in Tulsa and February 2 in Oklahoma City.

The Oklahoma City workshop will be at the Oklahoma County Extension Center at 2500 N.E. 63rd St. in Oklahoma City. The Tulsa workshop will be at the Tulsa County Extension Office at 4116 E 15th in Tulsa.

Registration cost is \$50 for each location and will include a copy of Applying Pesticides Correctly. This is the study manual for the core and service technician exams.

To register for this class please go to the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) website at <http://pested.okstate.edu/html/practical.htm> and click on the register online link. Class information and an agenda is also at that website as well as future 2022 classes.
(OSU PSEP)

EPA RELEASES SUMMARY OF DICAMBA-RELATED INCIDENT REPORTS FROM THE 2021 GROWING SEASON

Today, as part of the Biden-Harris administration's commitment to transparency and scientific integrity, the Agency is providing a summary of dicamba-related incident reports from the 2021 growing season obtained from pesticide registrants, States, the general public, and non-governmental organizations.

Dicamba is an herbicide used to control certain types of broadleaf weeds. Some dicamba products can be sprayed over-the-top of genetically engineered soybeans and cotton after the crops have emerged from the ground. This use has been subject to considerable controversy, including the [2020 vacatur of the Agency's 2018 dicamba registrations](#)~~EXITEXIT EPA WEBSITE~~ and the [2021 EPA Inspector General report on the 2018 dicamba decision](#), both of which noted the Agency's failure to fully disclose and address risks of which it was aware.

Despite the control measures implemented in EPA's October 2020 dicamba registration decision, [the 2021 incident reports](#) show little change in number, severity, or geographic extent of dicamba-related incidents when compared to the reports the Agency received before the 2020 control measures were required. EPA received approximately 3,500 dicamba-related incident reports from the 2021 growing season indicating that:

- More than one million acres of non-dicamba-tolerant soybean crops were allegedly damaged by off-target movement of dicamba;
- A range of non-target agricultural crops were allegedly affected by dicamba, such as sugarbeets, rice, sweet potatoes, peanuts, and grapes;
- Dicamba allegedly damaged non-agricultural plants and trees, such as those that grow near homes and in wild areas, including a 160,000-acre wildlife refuge; and
- More than 280 incident reports came from counties where additional restrictions are

required to protect endangered species when dicamba is applied to dicamba-tolerant soybean and cotton crops.

Based on prior research and numerous stakeholder meetings, EPA has reason to believe the number of incidents reported significantly understates the actual number of incidents related to dicamba use. For example, in a 2020 memo, EPA estimated that one in 25 dicamba incidents was reported to EPA. No evidence available to EPA suggests that underreporting has changed.

Given the new information from the 2021 growing season, EPA is reviewing whether over-the-top dicamba can be used in a manner that does not pose unreasonable risks to non-target crops and other plants, or to listed species and their designated critical habitats. EPA is also evaluating all of its options for addressing future dicamba-related incidents. The regulatory tools that the Agency could use to address the extent and severity of the alleged dicamba-related incidents are unlikely to be fully implemented by the 2022 growing season due to the statutory processes the Agency is required to follow.

However, EPA is committed to helping states address issues related to incidents in their jurisdictions. If a state wishes to further restrict or narrow the over-the-top uses of dicamba, the Agency will work with them to support their goals. Additionally, due to the extent and severity of reported incidents from the 2021 growing season, EPA is unlikely to approve section 24(c) requests under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) to register additional uses of federally registered over-the-top dicamba products to meet special local needs.

EPA's decisions will continue to be informed by information submitted by, as well as discussions with, scientists, academics, state agriculture extension agents, pesticide registrants, growers, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials, and the State FIFRA Research and Evaluation Group. The Agency is committed to acting in a transparent manner, following well established regulatory processes, while upholding its mission of protecting human health and the environment.

To view the report and supporting documents, visit docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0492 at www.regulations.gov.

Background on Dicamba

In 2017 and again in 2018, EPA amended the registrations of all over-the-top dicamba products following reports that growers had experienced crop damage and economic losses resulting from the off-site movement of dicamba. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit [vacated the 2018 registrations in June 2020](#)~~EXIT~~ [EPA WEBSITE](#) on the basis that “EPA substantially understated risks that it acknowledged and failed entirely to acknowledge other risks.” Days after the court’s decision, EPA issued cancellation orders for the affected products that addressed existing stocks. An investigation by [EPA’s Office of the Inspector General](#) later found that EPA’s 2018 decision was influenced by political considerations and that senior management had changed career scientists’ analyses and conclusions without documented reasons, resulting in risks not being fully addressed.

In October 2020, EPA issued new registrations for two dicamba products and extended the registration of an additional dicamba product. These registration decisions were made with some input of EPA’s career scientists and managers, and were expected to address the risk concerns noted by the Ninth Circuit. All three registrations included new measures that the Agency expected would prevent off-target movement and damage to non-target crops and other plants.

Regulatory Process

Registrants can propose voluntary measures to amend their labels or cancel specific products or uses.

If EPA determines, following consideration of such a proposal, that such measures would address unreasonable adverse effects associated with the product or use, the Agency commits to conducting a public comment period prior to the adoption of any proposed decision designed to address the extent and severity of these incidents. In the absence of a voluntary request to cancel the product(s), it is unlikely that this process could occur and be fully implemented before the 2022

growing season. For more information see: [Voluntary Cancellation of a Pesticide Product or Use](#).

If EPA determines that it is necessary to initiate cancellation of a registration for a pesticide, the following process is used: [Pesticide Cancellation Under EPA's Own Initiative](#).

[Learn More](#).

(EPA, December 21, 2021)
<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-summary-dicamba-related-incident-reports-2021-growing-season>

EPA EXTENDS EXPIRATION DEADLINE FOR PESTICIDE APPLICATOR CERTIFICATION PLANS

Today, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing an extension to the expiration deadline of federal, state, territory, and tribal certification plans. The [2017 Certification of Pesticide Applicators final rule](#) had set stronger standards for people who apply restricted use pesticides (RUPs) and required that states, territories, tribes and federal agencies with existing certification plans submit proposed modifications by March 4, 2020, to comply with the updated federal standards. As specified in the rule, existing certification plans remain in effect until EPA completes its reviews and approves the proposed plan modifications, or until those plans otherwise expire on March 4, 2022, whichever is earlier. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 public health emergency, the complexity of plans, and the need for careful review of program-specific issues and questions, EPA is extending the existing plans’ expiration deadline from March 4, 2022, to November 4, 2022.

This interim final rule allows additional time for proposed certification plan modifications to continue being reviewed and approved by EPA without interruption to federal, state, territory, and tribal certification programs or to those who are certified to use RUPs under those programs. During the extension, EPA will issue a proposed rule and seek public comment

through a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on the need for extending the expiration date beyond November 4, 2022.

EPA has reviewed all proposed plan modifications and is making progress on sending agency comments to certifying authorities. To date, EPA has completed 45 final reviews of the 68 plans submitted by certifying authorities (states, territories, tribes and other federal agencies). During the extension, EPA and certifying authorities will continue to work together so that all plans meet the federal standards. EPA also intends to provide periodic notifications to the public when approvals have occurred. Any additional extension pursued by the Agency will be informed by both the progress on plan reviews and approvals during this extension period, and by the public comments on this interim final rule and the NPRM.

EPA encourages all stakeholders to submit comments on this current deadline extension, as well as comments on the need for, or concerns over, further extending the expiration date of existing plans. Comments submitted on this interim final rule will be considered in the development of the final rule.

[Read the interim final rule.](#)

(EPA December 17, 2021)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-extends-expiration-deadline-pesticide-applicator-certification-plans>

EPA SUED OVER SEED TREATMENTS

EPA has not yet responded to a 2017 petition by environmental groups, demanding the agency fully regulate pesticide-treated seed.

Now, in a lawsuit filed Dec. 15, those groups are asking a federal court to order the agency to act.

At issue is a 2017 rule-making petition filed by the Center for Food Safety, which argued that EPA should

regulate pesticide-treated seeds as pesticides. Currently, EPA says this kind of pesticide use falls under its "Treated Article exemption," and exempts treated seed from full regulation. The agency initiated a public comment period on the petition back in 2018, which garnered over 16,000 comments, but has since stalled on it.

In June 2021, in response to a DTN story on the lack of regulation and environmental costs of seed treatments, EPA stated that the agency was "working on a response" to the 2017 petition, but no action has been taken yet.

That constitutes an "unlawful delay," the plaintiffs of this new lawsuit wrote in their complaint, now in front of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

In the complaint, the plaintiffs -- the Center for Food Safety and the Pesticide Action Network -- allege that EPA's refusal to act on their petition has allowed "irreparable environmental harms" from treated seed to continue, including a recent environmental crisis in Mead, Nebraska, after an ethanol plant mishandled discard treated corn seed and its ethanol byproducts and wastewater. (See more on that from DTN here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

The plaintiffs also note that EPA has never formally codified its decision to exempt pesticide-treated seed, which allowed it to dodge a past lawsuit filed by the same plaintiffs back in 2016. Instead, EPA's continued exemption of treated seeds relies on a 2013 guidance document on investigating pesticide-related bee deaths.

In the interim, seed treatment use has increased significantly, with treated seed planted on roughly 180 million crop acres each year. Since the neonicotinoid insecticides coated on the seed are water-soluble and can slough off the seed, these pesticides have surfaced in mammals, birds, insects and many waterways, as well as human urine, the plaintiffs note in their lawsuit. (See more from DTN on the growing concerns over these environmental exposures from treated seed here: <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>)

In the past, EPA has used the treated articles exemption to exempt other pesticide-coated items, such as lumber or shower curtains, from full regulation.

But seed treatments include systemic pesticides that are taken up into plant tissue and are thus marketed as protecting both the seed and the growing young plant from insects and disease -- a fact that the plaintiffs in the lawsuit have seized upon.

"Because the coated seeds are not treated primarily to protect the seed itself, but rather to protect the growing plant, they cannot be properly exempted as 'treated articles' under the regulation," the lawsuit reads. "As a result, EPA has completely failed to assess the risks of these unregulated pesticides. It has also never provided the public with any justification for its exemption or codified that practice in its regulations."

The plaintiffs ask the court to order EPA to respond to the 2017 petition within 90 days.

At the time of publication, EPA had not yet responded to DTN's inquiries on this lawsuit.

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

See the original 2017 petition from the Center for Food Safety here: <https://www.epa.gov/...>

(Progressive Farmer, December 15, 2021)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2021/12/15/environmental-groups-sue-epa-lack>

NEW UF STUDY: KILLING THE BROOD KEY TO ELIMINATING TERMITE COLONIES

Taking an extended look inside a subterranean termite colony is a rare and almost non-existent opportunity unless you raise one. But scientists like Thomas Chouvenc rear colonies from a king and queen, allowing them to produce thousands of eggs that grow to full

maturity. In doing so, Chouvenc sheds a world of light into the species, the colony's social behaviors, survival tactics and weaknesses.

Chouvenc, an assistant professor of urban entomology at the UF/IFAS Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center (REC) produced colonies in his lab. The colonies of Formosan subterranean termites he raised are the subject of his latest study published in the Journal of Economic Entomology.

"Contrary to popular belief, you don't have to kill the queen. In fact, it's all about the eggs," said Chouvenc. "In this study, we demonstrate the process of how subterranean termite colonies feeding on bait products that contain chitin synthesis inhibitors can be eliminated successfully from the inside. We also confirm these commercially available termite baits are effective because they are using an unexpected termite Achilles' heel."

"Traditionally, structures have been treated by spraying pesticides in the surrounding soils to prevent these invasive subterranean termites from accessing it. However, a series of studies in the past few years has suggested that such treatment may only temporarily limit the termite's access. It has minimal impact on whole colonies," he said.

Termite colonies that are treated with liquid termiticides can continue to access surrounding trees and other untreated structures and complete their life cycle. That way, they make new colonies within the community.

"While liquid termite treatments may provide a short-term solution for structures from subterranean termite problems, it has been shown that the use of subterranean termite baits can provide sustainable, long-term protection against such invasive subterranean termites," said Chouvenc.

In previous studies, researchers confirmed that a termite bait treatment approach eliminates colonies that feed on it. In turn, eliminated colonies cannot contribute to the production of more termite colonies. That reduces the potential risk for damage to homeowner properties within the community. However, how termite baits work is sometimes misunderstood, said Chouvenc.

“It is commonly believed that to kill a termite colony, you need to kill the queen. It’s actually the opposite. Baited termite colonies at the end of their life would only display very old workers, and starving soldiers, the king and queen,” he said.

This led the research team to wonder what happens to the most vulnerable individuals within the colony -- their precious brood.

“The queen lays eggs, which develop into larvae, but the whole brood depends on workers to help young ones develop. If the entire brood dies, then the colony is doomed because it cannot replace an aging population,” Chouvenec said.

In this new study, UF/IFAS researchers showed that as termites feed on the bait, they share the food with all other termites in the colony, including the queen and king. It does not directly kill termites, but as workers must engage in regularly molting -- or replacing of their old skin -- the bait activates and kills each worker as it fails to molt properly.

“We discovered that, as the queen is exposed to the bait by being fed by her workers, she loses the ability to lay viable eggs, and all larvae dies within 20 days, long before workers start dying -- around 45 days after the start of the treatment,” Chouvenec said.

This finding revealed that, while it takes about 90 days to reach termite colony elimination with baits, the entire brood is already dead within 20 days. Meanwhile, the queen becomes incapable of laying new eggs. As workers progressively die by failing to molt, the queen and the king then die of starvation at the very end.

“Our study showed that, even if you see live termites in the bait station for a couple of months, all the eggs and larvae are already dead, and the colony has already reached a point of no return: the colony is already doomed for elimination,” Chouvenec said.

(PCT Online December 2, 2021)

<https://www.pctonline.com/article/uf-study-kill-brood-eliminate-termite-colony/>

SUPREME COURT TO ASK BIDEN'S INPUT IN BID TO END BAYER ROUNDUP LAWSUIT

The U.S. Supreme Court signaled interest in Bayer AG’s bid to stop thousands of claims that its top-selling Roundup weedkiller causes cancer, asking the Biden administration for advice on whether to hear the company’s appeal in potentially a multibillion-dollar case.

Bayer is challenging a \$25 million award to Edwin Hardeman, a California man who says decades of exposure to Roundup caused his non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Bayer argues that federal approval of Roundup’s label meant Hardeman’s suit -- and others like it -- couldn’t go forward.

The litigation is a test case for what ultimately could be tens of thousands of claims. In July, Bayer said a Supreme Court ruling in its favor would “effectively and largely end” U.S. Roundup litigation, while at the same time setting aside \$4.5 billion in case the court rejected the appeal. All told, Bayer has pledged more than \$16 billion to fight and settle Roundup litigation.

Bayer shares jumped as much as 3.2% on the news and were trading at 46.86 euros (\$53.18) as of 4:20 p.m. in Frankfurt trading. The stock has lost about half its value since it acquired Monsanto Co., the herbicide’s maker, in 2018.

The Supreme Court action prompted Bayer to say in a statement it won’t take part in any further settlement discussions with lawyers who represent a substantial number of plaintiffs. The company said it was “encouraged” by the request and “believes there are strong legal arguments to support Supreme Court review and reversal.”

The court directed its request to U.S. Solicitor General Elizabeth Prelogar, the Biden

administration's top courtroom lawyer. Under the court's normal scheduling practices, the justices probably will say before their term ends in late June whether they will hear the case.

The Monsanto purchase closed just weeks before the first U.S. jury found that Roundup had caused cancer. The company has lost three of the five cases to go to trial, though it has won the two most recent verdicts.

Hardeman says he used Roundup from the 1980s to 2012 on his large plot of land in Sonoma County, about 60 miles (100 kilometers) north of San Francisco. He was diagnosed with lymphoma in 2015.

He sued under California law, claiming that Monsanto's failure to warn of Roundup's carcinogenic risk caused his illness. Jurors awarded him more than \$80 million, later cut by the trial judge to \$25 million. A federal appeals court upheld the award.

Pesticide law

At the Supreme Court, Bayer argues that Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act shields the company from liability. FIFRA, as the law is known, says states may not impose packaging or labeling requirements that are "in addition to or different from" those under the federal law.

The Supreme Court interpreted that provision in 2005 to allow failure-to-warn suits under state law as long as the state requirements are "genuinely equivalent" to those under FIFRA.

In its appeal, Bayer contends the verdict and appeals court ruling held the company to a tougher standard than federal regulators have under FIFRA. Bayer says the Environmental Protection Agency in 2019 told manufacturers of glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup, that no request to add a

cancer warning would be approved because it would be false and misleading. Bayer has steadfastly maintained Roundup doesn't cause cancer.

Under the appeals court ruling, "a company can be severely punished for marketing a product without a cancer warning when the near-universal scientific and regulatory consensus is that the product does not cause cancer, and the responsible federal agency has forbidden such a warning," Bayer argued.

Hardeman's lawyers disputed that contention, saying the EPA's 2019 letter doesn't address the "unique risks" posed when glyphosate is combined with other ingredients. They said the EPA has approved warnings on glyphosate-based formulations like Roundup and has never reached any conclusion as to whether those formulations cause cancer.

Under the Supreme Court's 2005 ruling, "where, as here, a plaintiff proves that a herbicide is dangerous to human health, the manufacturer can be found in violation of both state and federal law," Hardeman's team argued.

Bayer also argued that the trial judge improperly allowed expert testimony that Roundup causes cancer. The company said the testimony was speculative.

Bayer announced in July it will pull the current version of the weedkiller off the U.S. consumer market in 2023.

The case is Monsanto v. Hardeman, [21-241](#).

(Southwest Farmpress, December 13, 2021)
<https://www.farmprogress.com/business/supreme-court-ask-bidens-input-bid-end-bayer-roundup-lawsuit>

AG FERGUSON: AMAZON WILL PAY \$2.5 MILLION OVER ILLEGAL SALES OF REGULATED PESTICIDES

Attorney General Bob Ferguson announced today Seattle-based online retailer Amazon will pay \$2.5 million for selling highly regulated pesticides on its online platform without a license and without collecting information about their use as required by law.

Washington law regulates the sale of agricultural and industrial-use pesticides because they pose higher risks to human health and the environment. Businesses that sell these pesticides are required by law to hold specific licenses and maintain records about their sales and use. Amazon failed to inform Washingtonians on the product pages, checkout pages or anywhere else that these regulated agricultural and industrial-use pesticides were different from regular home and garden products. Amazon's conduct created the impression that anyone could lawfully buy and use the pesticides without restriction.

In addition to paying \$2.5 million, Amazon is required to obtain a license in the future if it restarts sales of these regulated pesticides. The [consent decree](#), filed today in King County Superior Court, requires Amazon to enact specific and legally enforceable corporate reforms, including putting safeguards in place on its site to block illegal sales of these pesticides. It must not allow third-party sellers on its site to sell these dangerous pesticides to customers in Washington unless it provides a way for those sellers to comply with Washington's record-keeping requirements.

The Attorney General's Consumer Protection and Environmental Protection divisions conducted the investigation.

"Amazon is a powerful corporation — but it's not above the law," Ferguson said. "I will continue to serve as an independent watchdog to protect consumers and our environment, and ensure this major Washington company complies with the law."

Some regulated agricultural and industrial-use pesticides may contain active ingredients that could pose a risk to people or the environment, which is why regulation of these products is important. Depending on the pesticide, they could cause anything from skin irritation to breathing issues to neurological damage if the application or handling is done incorrectly. Improper use of others could harm food sources important to juvenile salmon or impact threatened and endangered species, including Chinook salmon and orcas. Others can damage sensitive crops if not used properly. Amazon made thousands of sales of regulated agricultural and industrial-use pesticides between 2013 and 2020.

The regulated pesticides Amazon sold are not available at regular home and garden stores. Sellers must be specifically licensed to sell them, and state law requires sellers to record specific information at the time of sale. For more dangerous Restricted Use Pesticides, the buyer must also be licensed as an applicator, and more detailed recordkeeping is required at the time of purchase, including verifying the buyer's license, and what the pesticide will be used for and where.

Restricted Use Pesticides include insecticides or fungicides used in production farming that can severely contaminate groundwater or nearby streams if used improperly.

Amazon sold these regulated pesticides on its site without a license, and without verifying the licenses of Restricted Use Pesticide purchasers, or collecting other legally required information, like the intended use of the pesticide. Because of Amazon's actions, there is no record of how or where the dangerous pesticides were used.

As a result of Ferguson's investigation, Amazon suspended all sales of these pesticides on its site.

Washingtonians who believe they may have unintentionally purchased these regulated pesticides from the online retailer should contact Amazon.

Resolution details

Amazon will pay \$2.5 million for selling the pesticides on its online platform without a license and without requiring buyers to provide information about the pesticides' use as required by law. The money will be used for future enforcement of the Consumer Protection Act and Washington's environmental laws, as well as attorney costs and fees.

In addition, Amazon is required to:

- Obtain a license and follow reporting requirements if the online retailer wishes to sell regulated pesticides in the future
- Update its automated systems to identify and block sales of the pesticides on its site by third-party sellers, and keep those systems up-to-date to ensure sales do not occur
- Work with consumers to ensure safe disposal of Restricted Use Pesticides purchased from its site, including offering to reimburse the customer, both when the sale of these pesticides is inadvertently allowed on its site going forward, and when an unlicensed consumer reaches out to Amazon about any Restricted Use Pesticides they purchased from its site before the consent decree was signed

If Amazon wants to allow third-party sellers to sell regulated pesticides in the future, it must:

- Collect the third-party seller's dealer license number to sell regulated pesticides
- Provide a mechanism for the sellers to collect information about the pesticide's use as required by Washington law
- Maintain records of all sales of regulated pesticides on its site, including those by third-party sellers

Assistant Attorneys General Andrea Alegrett, Joseph Kanada, Aileen Tsao and Junine So, as well as investigator Rebecca Hartsock, paralegals Ashleigh Palmer, Renae Smith, Tricia Kealy and Allison Cleveland, and legal assistants Chris Kiefer and Bryan Abejon, handled the case for Washington.

The Attorney General's Consumer Protection Division enforces the Consumer Protection Act and other statutes to help keep the Washington marketplace free of unfair and deceptive practices. The division investigates and files legal actions to stop unfair and deceptive practices, recovers refunds for consumers, seeks penalties and recovers costs and fees to ensure that wrongdoers pay for their actions.

In 2016, Ferguson established the Environmental Protection Division to protect our environment and the safety and health of all Washingtonians.

Both divisions receive minimal General Fund support from the Legislature, instead funding their work largely from recoveries in other cases.

The Legislature earlier this year passed the [Consumer Protection Improvement Act](#), an attorney general-request bill that increases the maximum civil penalties for Consumer Protection Act violations from \$2,000 to \$7,500. Consumer Protection Act penalties had not increased since they were adopted in 1970.

(Washington State Office of Attorney General
November 22, 2021)

<https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/ag-ferguson-amazon-will-pay-25-million-over-illegal-sales-regulated-pesticides>

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 13, 2022

Title: Farmers Cooperative Association Agronomy Updates

Location: Ponca City Ok

Contact: Kody Leonard (918) 244-8250

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

Date: January 17-19, 2022

Title: 2022 OAAA Ag Aviation Expo

Location: Embassy Suites Norman, OK

Contact: Sandy Wells (405) 341-3548

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

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

Date: January 19-20, 2022

Title: Red River Crops Conference

Location: Altus OK

Contact: Gary Strickland (580) 477-796

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

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

**Pesticide Safety
Education Program**