

PESTICIDE REPORTS

Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources • Oklahoma State University

<http://pested.okstate.edu>



February, 2023

CHEM

- 1 FEBRUARY TEST HELP WORKSHOPS
- 2 EPA RELEASES DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF CYANTRANILIPROLE'S EFFECTS ON ENDANGERED SPECIES
- 3 EPA IMPLEMENTS PROTECTIONS FOR ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES FROM FOUR PESTICIDES
- 4 CHEM COMPANIES DEFEND LOYALTY PROGRAMS
- 6 CLIMATE CHANGE MAY BE INCREASING THE USE OF PESTICIDES
- 7 EPA DENIES COMMENT EXTENSION REQUEST FOR RODENTICIDE PIDS
- 7 EPA SUED ON ENDOCRINE-DISRUPTOR CHEMS
- 9 CEU MEETINGS
- 11 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 11 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

FEBRUARY TEST HELP WORKSHOPS

The Oklahoma State University Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has scheduled test help workshops for February 7 in Tulsa and February 9 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 before February 6 for Tulsa and \$65 after February 6. Registration cost is \$50 before February 8 for Oklahoma City and \$65 after February 8. Registration 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. Future 2023 workshop dates can be found on the website as well.
(OSU PSEP)

EPA RELEASES DRAFT BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF CYANTRANILIPROLE'S EFFECTS ON ENDANGERED SPECIES

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is releasing its [draft biological evaluation \(BE\)](#) that contains EPA's analysis of the potential effects of the insecticide cyantraniliprole on federally listed endangered and threatened (listed) species and designated critical habitats. The draft BE will be available for public comment for 60 days.

Background on Cyantraniliprole

Cyantraniliprole can be used as a foliar spray or soil application on a variety of agricultural crops and as a seed treatment on some agricultural crops. It is also registered for non-agricultural uses, including on turf and ornamental plants.

After EPA registered products containing cyantraniliprole in 2014, the Center for Biological Diversity and the Center for Food Safety filed a petition for review in the D.C. Circuit, alleging that EPA had not met its Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation obligations before registering products containing cyantraniliprole. In 2017, the D.C. Circuit agreed and remanded the registrations without vacating them for EPA to complete effects determinations and any necessary consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or National Marine Fisheries Service (the Services).

In November 2022, the court ordered EPA to complete cyantraniliprole's effects determination by September 2023. The draft BE released today is an important step toward complying with the court's order and better protecting listed species.

Draft Biological Evaluation

EPA's draft BE finds that cyantraniliprole is "likely to adversely affect" (LAA) certain listed species and designated critical habitats. An [LAA](#)

[determination](#) means that EPA reasonably expects that at least one individual animal or plant, among a variety of listed species, may be exposed to cyantraniliprole at a sufficient level to have an adverse effect. This is the case even if a listed species is almost recovered to a point where it may no longer need to be listed. The draft BE also includes additional analyses and a discussion of potential mitigation measures to protect listed species as part of EPA's efforts to meet its obligations under the ESA, furthering the goals outlined in [EPA's April 2022 ESA Workplan](#).

In this draft BE, EPA refined its analysis to predict the likelihood that cyantraniliprole use could result in "jeopardy" (i.e., potential impacts to the survival of listed species) for any listed species or "adverse modification" of any designated critical habitats. In contrast to its LAA determinations, EPA's draft likelihood of jeopardy and adverse modification predictions examine effects of cyantraniliprole at the species scale (population as opposed to an individual of a species). EPA predicts that approved uses of cyantraniliprole could result in future jeopardy or adverse modification findings for a small percentage of listed species and critical habitats. While EPA has made predictions about the likelihood of jeopardy and adverse modification as part of its effects determinations consistent with 50 CFR 402.40(b)(1), the Services are responsible for making the actual jeopardy/adverse modification findings and have the sole authority to do so.

As part of its assessment, EPA evaluated the effects of cyantraniliprole on over 1,700 listed species and over 800 designated critical habitats in the United States and its territories and determined that cyantraniliprole, without further mitigation:

- Will cause no effect to 25 percent of listed species and 33 percent of critical habitats.
- May affect but is not likely to adversely affect 34 percent of listed species and 54 percent of critical habitats.
- Is likely to adversely affect and EPA predicts the likelihood that use will not cause jeopardy to 37 percent of listed species or adversely modify 12 percent of critical habitats.

- Is likely to adversely affect and EPA predicts the likelihood that use may cause jeopardy to 4 percent of listed species and adversely modify 1 percent of critical habitats.

To help protect listed species, EPA has identified several mitigation measures that could reduce spray drift from agricultural areas and runoff into water bodies. EPA expects that these measures, if adopted, would reduce effects on listed species such that EPA would not predict a likelihood of jeopardy for any listed species, including mammals, invertebrates, and species that rely on invertebrates, or adverse modification to any critical habitats in the final BE. EPA also identified mitigation measures to reduce “take” of listed species.

In 2022, the cyantraniliprole registrants submitted letters to EPA committing to initial measures that registrants will include on pesticide labels to reduce potential spray drift as well as some measures to reduce listed species exposure to cyantraniliprole-treated seeds. In 2023, the registrants agreed to submit labels with additional mitigations that address the findings in the draft BE for EPA’s review and consideration in the final BE. EPA encourages the public to comment on the BE, on the registrants’ commitments, and to suggest any other mitigation measures that may be appropriate.

After considering the public comments on the draft BE and any additional mitigations that are agreed upon with the cyantraniliprole registrants, EPA will make appropriate changes, issue a final BE, and initiate formal consultation. During formal consultation, the Services use EPA’s effects determinations to inform their biological opinions, which will include the final determinations of whether a pesticide jeopardizes listed species and/or adversely modifies critical habitats. Through formal consultation, the Service(s), EPA, the cyantraniliprole registrants, and other stakeholders may develop additional mitigation measures to protect listed species and critical habitats.

The draft BE will be available for public comment for 60 days in docket [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0668](https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-draft-biological-evaluation-cyantraniliproles-effects-endangered-species)

(EPA, January 31, 2023)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-draft-biological-evaluation-cyantraniliproles-effects-endangered-species>

EPA IMPLEMENTS PROTECTIONS FOR ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES FROM FOUR PESTICIDES

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has implemented measures to protect 28 federally endangered and threatened (listed) Pacific salmon and steelhead species and their designated critical habitat from the effects of bromoxynil, prometryn, metolachlor, and 1,3-D (also known as telone). Bromoxynil, prometryn, and metolachlor are herbicides used to control grasses and broadleaf weeds, and 1,3-D is a pesticide used in pre-plant soil fumigation.

Biological Opinions

In June 2021, after receiving public comments, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued final biological opinions for bromoxynil, prometryn, metolachlor, and 1,3-D. NMFS’s biological opinions found that registered uses of these pesticides do not jeopardize listed salmon and steelhead species or adversely modify their critical habitats. Because use of these pesticides may result in “take” of individuals of listed salmon and steelhead species, the biological opinions also describe measures to minimize the potential for take and any impacts of take. “Take” includes (among other things) unintentionally harming or killing an individual of a listed species.

Implementation

EPA has implemented these biological opinions by issuing [Endangered Species Protection Bulletins](#), available on the [Bulletins Live! Two](#) website, and approving label amendments to protect listed species, thereby fulfilling its obligations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for these pesticides for the listed salmon and steelhead species and their critical habitat.

The [Endangered Species Protection Bulletins](#) for the four pesticides describe geographically specific use limitations to protect listed salmon and steelhead species and critical habitat.

The Bulletins include mitigation measures such as no-spray buffers, retention ponds, and vegetated ditches to minimize potential take.

The amended labeling for bromoxynil, prometryn, metolachlor, and 1,3-D products includes instructions for pesticide users to obtain Bulletins and follow their required mitigation measures. The labeling also includes guidance on how to report ecological incidents associated with pesticide applications, should users observe any. This work aligns with the goals outlined in EPA's [April 2022 ESA Workplan](#) and its [November 2022 ESA Workplan Update](#) to provide practical, timely protections for listed species from pesticides.

Background

Before NMFS developed these final biological opinions, EPA and NMFS determined that the registered uses of these pesticides have the potential to adversely affect one or more individuals of listed Pacific salmon and steelhead species. The "[likely to adversely affect](#)" ([LAA](#)) [determination](#) means that the Agencies reasonably expect that at least one individual animal or plant, among a variety of listed species, may be exposed to bromoxynil, prometryn, metolachlor, and 1,3-D at a sufficient level to have an adverse effect. An LAA determination does not necessarily mean that a pesticide registration action will jeopardize a listed species or adversely modify critical habitat.

See the [final biological opinion for 1,3-D and metolachlor](#) and the final [biological opinion for bromoxynil and prometryn](#).

(EPA, February 1, 2023)
<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-implements-protections-endangered-fish-species-four-pesticides>

CHEM COMPANIES DEFEND LOYALTY PROGRAMS

Syngenta Crop Protection and Corteva Inc. asked a federal court to dismiss a lawsuit brought by 10 state

attorneys general and the Federal Trade Commission that alleged the companies paid distributors to block competitors from selling less-expensive generic products to farmers.

In two separate motions filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of Middle North Carolina, the companies defended the legality of so-called loyalty programs at the center of the complaint.

The FTC and the states have alleged distributors only get paid if they limit business with competing manufacturers. Such arrangements, the complaint said, are "cutting off" competition and allowing the companies to "inflate their prices and force American farmers to spend millions of dollars more for their products."

In particular, the lawsuit alleged Syngenta has monopoly and market power on the fungicide azoxystrobin, and the herbicides mesotrione and metolachlor. The suit cites Corteva's herbicides rimsulfuron and acetochlor and the insecticide and nematicide oxamyl.

COMPANIES: LOYALTY DISCOUNTS "COMMON, LAWFUL"

"Plaintiffs ignore the fact that loyalty discounts, which come in many forms are not only 'extremely common' but also 'presumptively lawful in all but a few carefully defined circumstances,'" Corteva said in a motion to dismiss.

"Exclusive dealing arrangements offer numerous procompetitive benefits, such as maintaining customers' incentives to invest in a manufacturer's products, ensuring consistent purchases by customers over time and reducing free riding by customers and competitors.

"Plaintiffs also elide the fact that Corteva's loyalty programs, which have been in place for many years, relate to a small number of its products, have significantly decreased prices to its customers over many years, and have successfully encouraged its customers to invest in services, stewardship and support for Corteva's products."

Syngenta said in its motion to dismiss that the lawsuit advances an "unprecedented and unfounded theory" that an industry-standard rebate program offering a "modest, optional discount" to customers to incentivize increased purchases violates antitrust laws.

"Rebate programs that reduce prices to above-cost levels are permissible as a matter of law, except in narrow circumstances where customers are forced to participate by coercive non-price features," Syngenta said. "Nothing of the sort is pleaded or present here."

The company said the lawsuit describes a "standard, above-cost rebate program" that offers lower prices to incentivize customers to purchase more of a particular Syngenta product line.

"This program is entirely lawful," Syngenta said in its motion. "As courts have repeatedly recognized, the only 'harm' that such a program could cause is pressuring rivals to compete more vigorously."

Syngenta said if the complaint is upheld by the court, there's concern that "virtually any loyalty rebate program" could "plausibly be alleged" to be anticompetitive.

"That is not the law, and the court should not create new law that would punish the very conduct -- price cutting -- the antitrust laws are designed to promote," Syngenta said.

"The amended complaint's deficiencies are particularly glaring given that: (i) the FTC investigated Syngenta -- obtaining nearly unlimited discovery from Syngenta and third parties -- for three years before filing this lawsuit; and (ii) plaintiffs have now taken the opportunity to amend in response to Syngenta's original motion to dismiss. If any facts could have been pleaded to bolster plaintiffs' claims, they would have been pleaded."

Corteva said in its motion the loyalty programs are "purely voluntary" and offer discounts to distributors that choose to participate, and "no one is forced" to take part in the programs.

"The programs are one year in duration and do not obligate distributors to purchase any Corteva products at all," the motion said.

"Distributors are free to cease purchasing Corteva's products at any time with the sole consequence being the loss of a discount. And they do not result in below cost or predatory pricing. Plaintiffs have not alleged -- and could not allege -- otherwise.

"Rather, they merely recast the rebates awarded under the programs as 'payments' and declare them to be exclusionary. More is required. Tellingly, the loyalty programs for each of the three Corteva AIs at issue were implemented many years ago, in two cases at least a decade after the statutory exclusivity protections on the products expired."

Syngenta and Corteva are two of the largest pesticide manufacturers operating in the United States. Syngenta, based in Switzerland, is a subsidiary of a Chinese state-owned company. Corteva, headquartered in Indianapolis, is the company formed as part of a merger between DuPont and Dow Chemical Company.

COMPLAINT PART OF BROADER PUSH TO UNLOCK COMPETITION

The FTC was joined in the complaint by attorneys general in California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Texas and Wisconsin.

The complaint alleges Syngenta and Corteva take "illegal" steps to stop generic pesticides from eating into their profits. The loyalty programs include making payments to distributors -- as long as the distributors keep their purchases of competing generic pesticides beneath a certain threshold.

The FTC said the complaint was part of a "broader push to unlock competition and innovation in the American economy" as well as to "protect consumers and small businesses and crack down on unfair tactics by dominant companies."

The complaint also alleges the companies violated state-competition and consumer protection laws in California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Texas and Wisconsin.

Read more on DTN:

"Syngenta, Corteva Sued by FTC, States," <https://www.dtnpf.com/...>

(Progressive Farmer, January 25, 2023)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2023/01/25/syngenta-corteva-say-loyalty-lawful>

CLIMATE CHANGE MAY BE INCREASING THE USE OF PESTICIDES

A new report from the Pesticide Action Network finds pesticide use is expected to increase and become more hazardous as the climate warms.

California farmers used nearly 18% of all the pesticides applied in the country and pesticide use is four and a half times higher in the Golden State than the national average.

California farmers use more than 200 million pounds of the active ingredients in pesticides every year.

The Food and Agriculture Department finds pesticide use in the United States climbed 5% between 2005 and 2020. Herbicide use was up more than 34% during the same period.

The chemical use in large scale farming is increasing as effectiveness drops and climate change is widely expected to put additional pressure on agriculture.

“As climate change impacts decrease the efficacy of pesticides, climate change impacts are also predicted to worsen pest pressures and problems,” said Asha Sharma, a researcher with the Pesticide Action Network.

“At the same time climate change is supposed to negatively impact crop health.”

It doesn't help that the majority of synthetic pesticides are made from fossil fuel derivatives and some pesticides like food fumigant sulfuryl fluoride are greenhouse gasses themselves.

The chemicals contribute to greenhouse gas emissions when they are made, distributed, and used on fields.

The report insists that the nation needs to wean itself off large scale pesticide use because as the climate warms and effectiveness of pesticides fall, more and more will have to be used to get the same results.

The report calls for farmers to adopt more ecologically friendly farming practices, like rotating crops and relying on natural methods to control pests.

“So, if you have problems with cucumber beetles,” said Robert Faux, a farmer in Iowa. “Then you try and provide habitat for things like snakes and frogs and some of the critters that find cucumber beetles to be very tasty.”

Researchers suggest that the nation's food system can also focus on rotating more crops so the pests that feed on a single crop do not build up in a region.

“You're continually rotating or intercropping with different crops that do not have those same pests or diseases,” Sharma said. “So, you're not going to need the huge amounts of pesticides that we see applied in conventional agriculture today.”

A more natural farming system relies less on pesticides and herbicides.

The report calls for government action that includes pesticides in climate planning that reduces reliance on synthetic pesticides, rules that reduce pesticide toxicity, and transitioning to agroecology.

(KPBS, January 24, 2023)

<https://www.kpbs.org/news/environment/2023/01/24/climate-change-may-be-increasing-the-use-of-pesticides>

EPA DENIES COMMENT EXTENSION REQUEST FOR RODENTICIDE PIDS

On Jan. 11, [EPA alerted stakeholders](#) that the Agency will not be granting a 60-day extension to the public comment period for EPA's Proposed Interim Decisions (PID) for Rodenticides (*see background below*). The deadline to submit public comments will remain Feb. 13, 2023.

EPA had received requests for the extension a number of groups, including the Rodenticide Task Force; Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials; National Pest Management Association (NPMA); CropLife America; Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment; Ag ProVision and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

J.D. Darr, director of legislative and regulatory affairs, NPMA, said the extension request was made because the volume and technical nature of the documents published to the docket requires intensive evaluation and consultation with technical experts and NPMA members who manufacture, sell and use rodenticides across the country.

"NPMA understands that the 75-day comment period was an extension to the traditional 60-day comment period; however, NPMA and its members lost more than 15 working days throughout the months of December and January due to holidays and other observances," Darr said. "Additionally, each state has comprehensive rules and regulations regarding rodenticides. Development of constructive comments will require extensive review of the potential impact of proposed changes to product labels and risk mitigation requirements."

Among the reasons EPA cited for denying the extension was a critical need for the Agency to "receive comments on the proposed mitigation measures such that it has time to incorporate any comments into its draft behavioral evaluation analyses" of the 11 rodenticide active ingredients.

Darr said NPMA and member companies have done a great job mobilizing and that state associations continue to comment on behalf of their member companies. "NPMA and its member companies are working around the clock to thoroughly review the PIDs, provide a comprehensive analysis to stakeholders, and formulate comments that highlight the impacts that the PIDs would have on industry," he said. "NPMA has a great working relationship with EPA, and we expect that the Agency will fully consider the perspective we provide them with through our public comments."

NPMA has assembled resources for state associations to submit public comments that highlight the unique impacts that the PIDs will have on member companies in their respective states. For more information contact Darr at jdarr@pestworld.org.

An resource for pest management professionals is the Rodenticide Task Force, which created a [PCO summary](#) of the EPA's proposed mitigation measures. RTF also has developed a [web page](#) that includes background on this topic, EPA documents, videos and instructions on [how to comment](#).

(PCT Online January 23, 2023)

<https://www.pctonline.com/news/epa-denies-pid-comment-period-extension/>

EPA SUED ON ENDOCRINE-DISRUPTOR CHEMS

The EPA has failed to test for and regulate pesticides with endocrine-disrupting qualities and should be ordered to do so by a court, according to a new lawsuit.

The lawsuit filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California alleges EPA was required

to develop an endocrine disruptor screening program under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 and to have that implemented by 1999.

"In the 26 years since, EPA has tested fewer than 50 of more than 1,315 registered pesticides for endocrine-disruption effects and completed only 34 of those tests," the Center for Food Safety said in a news release on Wednesday announcing the lawsuit.

Endocrine disruptors are found in blood and urine and can affect human fertility and metabolic systems and can cause a variety of health issues.

The CFS and farmworker safety groups that filed the lawsuit have asked the court to implement the actions required by the 1996 law "as soon as reasonably practicable."

EPA's Office of Inspector General found both in 2011 and 2021 that the agency had not made progress on such a review. According to the CFS, the EPA identified 18 chemicals as possible endocrine disruptors in 2015 but has not conducted a single test.

Other plaintiffs joining the lawsuit include the Center for Environmental Health, Pesticide Action Network of North America, Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Alianza Nacional de Campesinas and the Rural Coalition.

The lawsuit said EPA has "failed to even initiate endocrine testing for approximately 96% of registered pesticides."

The groups said DDT, chlorpyrifos, atrazine, 2,4-D and glyphosate are among the pesticides recognized as endocrine disruptors.

EPA was sued by the Natural Resources Defense Council in 1999 for failing to meet an August statutory deadline to implement a testing program. The lawsuit ended in a settlement in 2001 when EPA agreed to act.

"EPA committed to publishing a list of initial chemicals to evaluate by 2002," the lawsuit said. "Instead, EPA released a draft list of chemicals for evaluation in 2007

and a final list of 67 chemicals in 2009, seven years after their original promise."

In addition to the list of 67 possible endocrine-disrupting pesticides, EPA created a second list of 109 additional chemicals in need of testing.

"At the same time as EPA only managed to complete Tier 1 testing for 52 pesticides, EPA completed registration for 425 new pesticides without consideration of their potential endocrine effects," the lawsuit said, "flouting the whole point of Congress's FQPA mandates -- bringing the total number of registered pesticides from 890 in 1990 to 1,315 in 2020."

The groups allege EPA's lack of testing of those pesticides already has caused health issues for farmworkers and others.

"There is little doubt that EPA's failure to complete screening of all pesticide chemicals for possible endocrine effects has caused damage to plaintiffs' members' health," the lawsuit said.

"A wealth of scientific studies conclude that many chemicals in use today are endocrine disruptors capable of devastating adverse health impacts. Plaintiffs' members are routinely exposed to a myriad of pesticides, including the five EPA has flagged as possible endocrine disruptors, via their livelihoods and food consumption. EPA's continued failure to implement the EDSP and complete testing of all pesticides for possible endocrine effects compounds Plaintiffs' members' exposure."

Read the lawsuit
here: <http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/...>

(Progressive Farmer, December 21, 2022)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2022/12/21/lawsuit-epa-fails-test-pesticides>

CEU Meetings

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

Date: February 6, 2023

Title: Carter County Early Spring Roundup
Sprayer and Nozzle Calibration for Effective
Application

Location: Contact for Location

Contact: Tayler Denman (580) 223-6570

<https://extension.okstate.edu/county/carter/agriculture.html>

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

Date: February 9, 2023

Title: Ensystem 2023 CEU Workshop

Location: Holiday Inn Express Durant OK

Contact: Don Stetler (281) 217-2965

<https://ceuworkshop.com/>

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

Date: February 15, 2023

Title: Caddo Kiowa Winter Meeting 2023

Location: Contact for Location

Contact: Heath Hull (405) 668-0108

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

Date: February 21, 2023

Title: The Fungus Among Us – Fungal Biopesticides: A
Growing Option in Pest Control

Location: US Environmental Protection Agency
(Virtual)

Contact: Dr. Marcia Anderson (908)-577-2982

<https://www.epa.gov/ipm/upcoming-integrated-pest-management-webinars>

CEU's:	Category(s):
TBD	TBD

Date: February 21, 2023

Title: Pecan Pest Management Workshop

Location: Gordon Cooper Technology Center, Shawnee,
Oklahoma

Contact: Becky Carroll (405) 744-6139

https://okstatecasnr.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_dhfyCnKcKGeSmTs

CEU's:	Category(s):
5	1A
5	10

Date: February 23, 2023

Title: 2023 Eckroat Seed Company Turfgrass
Professional Education Session

Location: Contact for Location

Contact: Mike Link (405) 317-8484

CEU's:	Category(s):
2	All

Date: March 2, 2023

Title: OSU Grape Management Course Grape Disease
Management

Location: Contact for Location

Contact: Aaron Essary (405) 744-7472

<https://extension.okstate.edu/programs/viticulture-and-enology/2023-grape-management-course.html>

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

Date: March 7-8, 2023

Title: 2023 OKVMA Spring Conference
Location The Champion Convention Center Oklahoma City OK
Contact: Kiersten Riggs (918) 314-9032
<https://okvma.com/conferences/>

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

Date: March 8-9, 2023

Title: Kansas Pest Control Association Spring Conference
Location Drury Plaza Hotel & Conference Center Wichita, KS
Contact: Jared Harris (785) 633-0192
<https://kpca.wildapricot.org/events>

CEU's:	Category(s):
1	3A
6	7A
6	7B
2	8

Date: March 9, 2023

Title: Vesperis 2023 Annual CEU Workshop
Location: Stoney Creek Hotel Broken Arrow, OK
Contact: Erin Monteagudo (512) 721-3945

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

Date: March 23, 2023

Title: 2023 Oklahoma Peanut EXPO
Location: SWOSU Business Enterprise Center - Weatherford, OK
Contact: David Nowlin (405) 933-0641
<http://www.okpeanutcomm.org/upcoming-events.html>

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

Date: April 6, 2023

Title: 2023 Oklahoma Beef Summit
Location: Contact for Location
Contact: Justin McDaniel (405) 527-2174

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

Date: April 27, 2023

Title: East Central Pesticide Conference
Location: Contact for Location
Contact: Jennifer Patterson (918) 696-2253

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>

Markev Training <https://www.markevtraining.com/>

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

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

Find us on Twitter at @OkstatePestEd

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

South Penn - Moore Norman Technology Center 13301 S. Pennsylvania, Oklahoma City, OK 73170

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