

PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



March, 2023

CHEM

- 1 DATES SET FOR SPRING UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSALS
- 2 APRIL TEST HELP WORKSHOPS
- 2 EPA PROPOSES RULE TO PROTECT FARMWORKERS AND PESTICIDE HANDLERS FROM EXPOSURES
- 3 FDA AND EPA ANNOUNCE VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING AND COMMENT PERIOD ON MODERNIZING THEIR APPROACH TO OVERSIGHT OF CERTAIN PRODUCTS FOR ANIMALS, INCLUDING FLEA AND TICK PRODUCTS
- 5 EPA BIOLOGICAL OPINION FINDS CYANTRANILIPROLE LIKELY TO AFFECT CERTAIN SPECIES
- 6 HY-VEE TO PAY EPA PENALTY FOR SELLING UNREGISTERED PESTICIDE PRODUCT AT JOCO STORE
- 6 HARMFUL PESTICIDES IN MUSEUM COLLECTIONS COMPLICATE REPATRIATION EFFORTS
- 8 EPA TACKLES ENDANGERED SPECIES DUTIES
- 10 CEU MEETINGS
- 12 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 12 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION
- 13 McAlester Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Flyer
- 14 Kingfisher Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Flyer

DATES SET FOR SPRING UNWANTED PESTICIDE DISPOSALS

ODAFF has scheduled the next Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program collection dates for April 2023. They will occur April 25 in McAlester and April 27 in Kingfisher. The locations are the Southeast Expo Center and the Kingfisher County Fairgrounds. The Disposals 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.

April 25 Southeast Expo Center,
4500 West, 4500 US-270, McAlester, OK

April 27 Kingfisher County Fairgrounds
300 South 13th St., Kingfisher, OK

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

APRIL TEST HELP WORKSHOPS

The Oklahoma State University Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has scheduled test help workshops for April 11 in Oklahoma City and April 13 in Tulsa.

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 April 10 for Oklahoma City and \$65 after April 10. Registration cost is \$50 before April 12 for Tulsa and \$65 after April 10. 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 PROPOSES RULE TO PROTECT FARMWORKERS AND PESTICIDE HANDLERS FROM EXPOSURES

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a proposed rule that would improve and modernize the pesticide Application Exclusion Zone (AEZ) requirements under the 2015 Agricultural Worker Protection Standard (WPS), reaffirming the Agency's commitment to protecting farmworkers, pesticide handlers, their families, and agricultural communities from pesticide exposure during National Pesticide Safety Education Month.

"EPA's top priority is to protect public health and the environment, and today's proposal is a significant step forward to further protect the farmworkers, farmers and pesticide handlers who deliver the fuel, fiber and food that runs America," **said EPA Administrator Michael**

S. Regan. "Farmworker justice is environmental justice, and we're continuing to take action to make sure these communities are protected equally under the law from pesticide exposure."

Application Exclusion Zone

The Worker Protection Standard regulations offer protections to over two million agricultural workers and pesticide handlers who work at over 600,000 agricultural establishments. In 2015, EPA made significant changes to the standard to decrease pesticide exposure among farmworkers and their family members. Less pesticide exposure means a healthier workforce and fewer lost wages, medical bills and absences from work.

Among the changes, the revised standard included a new provision requiring agricultural employers to keep workers and all other individuals out of an area called the AEZ during outdoor pesticide applications. The AEZ is the area surrounding an ongoing pesticide application that people must not enter to avoid exposure. An AEZ moves with the equipment during applications to protect farmworkers and bystanders that could be contacted by pesticides.

In 2020, the previous administration published a rule specific to the AEZ requirements, limiting the applicability of the protections to the agricultural employer's property and shrinking the AEZ size from 100 feet to 25 feet for some ground-based spray applications. Prior to the effective date of the 2020 AEZ Rule, petitions were filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (SDNY) and in the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals challenging the 2020 Rule (now consolidated as case number 20 Civ. 10642). The SDNY issued an order granting the petitioners' request for a temporary restraining order. As a result, the 2020 AEZ Rule has not gone into effect, and the AEZ provisions in the 2015 WPS remain in effect.

Through its review, EPA has determined that the provisions in the 2020 AEZ Rule that weakened protections for farmworkers and nearby communities from pesticide exposure should be rescinded to protect the health of farmworkers, their families, and nearby communities.

Proposed Changes and Flexibilities

With today's action, the Agency is proposing to reinstate several provisions from the 2015 WPS to strengthen protections for farmworkers and bystanders including:

- Applying the AEZ
 - beyond an establishment's boundaries; and
 - when individuals are within easements (such as easement for utility workers to access telephone lines).
- Establishing AEZ distances for ground-based spray applications of
 - 25 feet for medium or larger sprays when sprayed from a height greater than 12 inches from the soil surface or planting medium; and
 - 100 feet for fine sprays.

Additionally, EPA is proposing to retain two provisions in the 2020 AEZ Rule that the Agency believes are consistent with the intent of the 2015 WPS AEZ requirements and are supported by information available to the Agency to provide more clarity and flexibility for farming families. EPA proposes to retain:

- a clarification that suspended pesticide applications can resume after people leave the AEZ; and,
- an "immediate family exemption" that allows only farm owners and the farm owners' immediate family to remain inside enclosed structures or homes while pesticide applications are made, providing family members flexibility to decide whether to stay on-site during pesticide applications, rather than compelling them to leave even when they feel safe remaining in their own homes.

The proposed changes are a critical part of EPA's efforts to protect the health of farmworkers and support the Agency's priority to advance equity and justice for all communities. Learn more about EPA's extensive efforts to train, support and enhance safe working conditions for agricultural workers at local, state, and national levels on [EPA's website](#).

Upon publication of the federal register notice, the [proposed rule](#) will be available for public comment for 60 days in docket [EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0133](#)

(EPA, February 16, 2023)

<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-proposes-rule-protect-farmworkers-and-pesticide-handlers-exposures>

FDA AND EPA ANNOUNCE VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING AND COMMENT PERIOD ON MODERNIZING THEIR APPROACH TO OVERSIGHT OF CERTAIN PRODUCTS FOR ANIMALS, INCLUDING FLEA AND TICK PRODUCTS

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP) is co-hosting a virtual public meeting with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Center of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) on March 22, 2023. Additionally, EPA is opening a docket for the agencies to receive public comment on their current approach to the oversight of various products regulated as either pesticides by EPA or new animal drugs by FDA, with a focus on parasite treatment products applied topically to animals and in genetically engineered pest animals for use as pest control tools. The agencies are also announcing the availability of, and soliciting comment on, a document entitled, "WHITEPAPER: A Modern Approach to EPA and FDA Product Oversight," which describes the current challenges and highlights the potential benefits of a modernized approach to oversight of these products.

Currently, EPA and FDA determine regulatory oversight of pesticides and new animal drugs based on the rationale described in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the agencies signed in 1971 and revised in 1973. Since that time, pesticide and animal drug technologies—and both agencies' understanding of these technologies—have evolved.

For example, parasite treatment products applied topically to animals (including pets) generally are regulated by EPA if they remain on the skin to control

only external parasites (e.g., collars or spot-ons to control fleas and ticks) and by FDA if they are absorbed systemically into the bloodstream. The agencies now understand that many of the topically administered products currently regulated by EPA do not remain on the skin and are actually absorbed into the bloodstream, highlighting challenges with the current approach and raising different safety concerns than originally anticipated.

Additionally, genetically engineered (“GE”) pest animals, which are gaining interest as a pest control tool and which can reduce the need for conventional pesticides, were not envisioned 50 years ago when the original regulatory approach was developed. As agreed in the [2016 National Strategy for Modernizing the Regulatory System for Biotechnology Products](#), EPA and FDA have considered how to update their respective responsibilities with the goal of developing an efficient, transparent, and predictable approach for overseeing GE insects. Recently, [Executive Order 14081 \(PDF\)](#), issued September 12, 2022, has further directed the agencies to improve the clarity and efficiency of the regulatory process for biotechnology products, underscoring the need for continued coordination between the agencies on biotechnology. The whitepaper and public meeting only address EPA and FDA oversight.

The agencies’ current approach to determining whether EPA or FDA is the appropriate regulator of certain products does not effectively reflect or accommodate scientific advancement, and it has become clear in some cases that the current approach has resulted in misalignment between product characteristics and the agency better equipped to regulate the product. A modernized approach would ensure that the oversight of these products better aligns with each agency’s expertise, accounts for scientific advancement, avoids redundancy, better protects animal health and safety, and improves regulatory clarity for regulated entities, animal owners, veterinarians, and other stakeholders.

EPA and FDA are considering how best to update their respective oversight responsibilities for specific products in an efficient and transparent manner and in alignment with each agency’s expertise, with the goal of improving protection of human, animal, and environmental health. The purpose of the public comment period and virtual

public meeting is to obtain feedback from stakeholders on the whitepaper and ideas for modernizing EPA’s and FDA’s approach to product oversight.

Upon publication of the Federal Register notice announcing the upcoming virtual public meeting, the [whitepaper](#) will be available for public comment for 60 days in docket [EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0103](#) at www.regulations.gov. Comments submitted to the docket and/or presented at the public meeting should be limited to the questions/topics posed in the Federal Register Notice only.

Registration for the virtual public meeting closes at 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on March 15, 2023. Requests for oral presentations must be made by March 15, 2023. Public comments can be submitted electronically via the Federal eRulemaking Portal starting February 23, 2023, until April 24, 2023. All comment submissions received must reference Docket No. EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0103. To register to attend the public meeting, visit <https://www.eventbrite.com/e/547810324427>. To request to make an oral presentation or for detailed instructions for submitting electronic comments, visit [EPA’s public meeting webpage](#) for more information.

For more information:

- [Virtual Public Meeting: FDA and EPA Product Oversight](#)
- [Federal Register Notice](#)
- [Docket: EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0103](#)

(EPA, February 22, 2023)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/fda-and-epa-announce-virtual-public-meeting-and-comment-period-modernizing-their>

EPA BIOLOGICAL OPINION FINDS CYANTRANILIPROLE LIKELY TO AFFECT CERTAIN SPECIES

The insecticide cyantraniliprole is likely to adversely affect certain listed species and designated critical habitats, the EPA said in a draft biological opinion the agency released on Tuesday.

Last November, EPA was ordered by a federal appeals court to assess the chemical's risk to endangered species and to update its labeling to include mitigation measures. The agency has until September 2023 to complete the process.

"An LAA (likely to adversely affect) 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," the agency said in a news release.

Cyantraniliprole is the active ingredient in both Corteva Agriscience's Lumiderm seed treatment and Syngenta's Fortenza.

The chemical is a Group 28 insecticide (diamides). Fortenza is available for use in Canada in canola, corn and soybeans to target pests such as wireworm, cutworm and European chafer. Lumiderm is registered in Canada for use in canola and soybeans to control flea beetles, cutworms, bean leaf beetles and soybean aphids.

As part of its assessment, EPA evaluated the effects of cyantraniliprole on more than 1,700 listed species and more than 800 designated critical habitats in the U.S. and its territories.

EPA said cyantraniliprole was likely to adversely affect and may cause jeopardy to 4% of listed species and adversely modify 1% of critical habitats.

The agency said it predicts the chemical will cause no effect to 25% of listed species and 33% of critical habitats. In addition, EPA said the insecticide "may

affect" but is "not likely" to affect 34% of listed species and 54% of critical habitats.

The draft opinion will be available for a 60-day public comment period.

EPA took the action as a result of a ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit as part of an ongoing legal battle.

The agency is required by the court to file a progress report with the court every 60 days.

In 2014, the EPA registered the pesticide without first determining whether it would have adverse effects on endangered species. The court ruled in June 2017 that EPA violated the Endangered Species Act by registering the insecticide "before making an ESA effects determination or consulting with other agencies."

Then, in 2019, the agency was ordered by the DC Circuit to fulfill its statutory obligation. The EPA has yet to do so.

In January 2022, EPA announced plans to -- for the first time in decades -- fully comply with the Endangered Species Act.

According to the court's ruling, the environmental groups said during oral arguments they no longer will seek to vacate cyantraniliprole's registration because EPA agreed to meet the September 2023 deadline. If that deadline is unmet, the court said, the groups would be allowed to renew a motion for vacatur.

The Center for Biological Diversity and the Center for Food Safety originally asked the court to grant an order requiring EPA to conduct an ESA analysis within six months or face vacatur of the insecticide registration.

Read more on DTN:

"EPA Ordered to Make Endangered Species Act Assessment on Insecticide Cyantraniliprole by 2023,"

(Progressive Farmer, January 31, 2023)
<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2023/01/31/epa-biological-opinion-finds-likely>

HY-VEE TO PAY EPA PENALTY FOR SELLING UNREGISTERED PESTICIDE PRODUCT AT JOCO STORE

Hy-Vee will pay more than \$5,000 for selling an unregistered pesticide product at an Overland Park store, the Environmental Protection Agency said Tuesday.

The company MJB Worldwide LLC distributed Outlaw Germ Justice Disinfectant Wipes to Hy-Vee stores in Kansas, Missouri, Iowa and Minnesota, the EPA said.

Under federal law, companies that make materials that kill bacteria and viruses such as COVID-19 have to register the the product with the EPA.

The agency discovered the wipes had not been registered and contacted MJB in November 2020. The company said it had recalled its Outlaw disinfectant products, but in January 2021, an EPA inspector discovered the wipes for sale at an Overland Park Hy-Vee.

The EPA issued an order to MJB and Hy-Vee to stop the sale of the product and sequester any remaining packages of it.

Hy-Vee disposed of it without seeking approval from the federal agency.

The EPA and MJB settled an enforcement case for the product last July. The company is no longer an actively registered business, according to the EPA.

Hy-Vee will pay a \$5,374 civil penalty for violating the terms of the EPA's order.

“The registration of pesticide products with EPA is critical to protecting public health so consumers are

aware of a product's ingredients, how the product can be safely used, and how the product should be properly stored and disposed,” said David Cozad, director of EPA Region 7's enforcement and compliance assurance division.

The grocery store chain did not return a call seeking comment.

(The Kansas City Star, March 1, 2023)
<https://www.kansascity.com/news/local/article272626975.html>

HARMFUL PESTICIDES IN MUSEUM COLLECTIONS COMPLICATE REPATRIATION EFFORTS

The use of pesticides and preservatives in museums dates back hundreds of years. But as institutions face public pressure to repatriate cultural items looted over centuries of imperialism, what has long been a common practice to protect collections from pests and mold is now coming under scrutiny. And for the tribal communities involved in these repatriation efforts, the contamination of these objects presents a multitude of questions around the safe handling and use of returned items.

Since the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) in 1989 and the implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990, US museums involved in repatriation efforts have been grappling with the dilemma of sacred Indigenous objects and remains contaminated by toxic pesticides and preservatives.

“A lot of these items are considered to be living and breathing, and need to maintain that cultural use, and that is something that practitioners in the field within museums have become a lot more aware of over time,” Alex Lucas, NAGPRA's program manager and interim

repatriation coordinator at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) told Hyperallergic.

In 2001, the National Park Service compiled a list of more than 50 substances that were used to treat collections in many American museums since the 18th century. These include arsenic, heavy metals like lead and mercury, carbon disulfide, paradichlorobenzene (PDB), dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT), and ethylene oxide. Although museums have long since moved away from these hazardous chemical treatments and toward more integrated pest control methods, the likelihood of objects eligible for repatriation being contaminated is still very high, according to NMAI.

“As a matter of standard practice, and I believe in most museums, we operate under the assumption that every item may have something on it because of this history,” Eric Hollinger, a tribal liaison for the repatriation office of the Smithsonian’s National Museum of Natural History, told Hyperallergic.

For tribal members, this history can pose hazards. Those interested in incorporating previously held items such as repatriated regalia back into ceremonial practice worry that contaminated objects might endanger their health. For others seeking the reburial of ancestral remains, there are concerns that preservatives and pesticides could potentially poison the surrounding environment.

“[Before NAGPRA] museums and the conservation profession had been generating information about pesticides, but it was primarily to the focus of how they changed the color, the texture, and the quality of an object or an artwork — not how they damaged people, because nobody knew that objects would ever leave the collections,” said Nancy Odegaard, a conservator at the Arizona State Museum and anthropology professor.

An X-ray fluorescence analyzer being used on a Sámi coat in the NMNH collections (photo courtesy Anne May Olli)

In order to analyze potentially contaminated collections, many institutions have adopted the use of X-ray fluorescence (XRF), which can detect mercury, lead, and arsenic. But Hollinger points out that the technology’s testing capability is limited to these elements.

In recent years, the issue of Native remains and cultural objects held in American institutions has grown more visible. Last month, ProPublica published a new investigation featuring a searchable database tracking over 100,000 Native American remains in US organizations. In New York, confirmed or possible Native remains were reported in institutions including the Brooklyn Museum, the Brooklyn Children’s Museum, and the American Museum of Natural History. According to ProPublica, the University of California, Berkeley holds the remains of at least 9,058 Native American individuals, and the University of Arizona reportedly has at least 2,400 remains. UCB also told Hyperallergic last month that the institution holds an additional 13,000 ceremonial objects and approximately 200,000 archaeological objects that the campus believes are potentially sacred and eligible for repatriation.

Lisa Bruno, the chief conservator for the Brooklyn Museum, shared that in her experience tribal communities have been interested in learning about potential contaminants.

“Sometimes, the objects themselves are decorated with pigments that also have arsenic. So, the object may have evidence of arsenic, but it may not have evidence of pesticide because the arsenic is coming from the pigment. That is equally as important for tribal communities to know,” Bruno told Hyperallergic.

But even with the technological advances in testing, there are tribal communities who still view this type of testing of ancestral remains and sacred objects as an invasive and destructive process.

“Too often, people try to be proactive and get this testing done, and may be doing testing that isn’t needed, isn’t wanted, and is potentially damaging,” Melodi McAdams, a tribal heritage specialist for the United Auburn Indian Community, said during a recent NAGPRA Community of Practice Call.

McAdams went on to explain how museums can use alternative information-gathering methods to determine an object’s contamination history, rather than solely relying on testing, in order to provide tribes with informed recommendations for safe handling and use of repatriated objects. Instead of resorting to unnecessary

chemical procedures, McAdams said, institutions can use systemic information to identify contaminated collections, such as referring to records of pesticide and preservative use and interviewing current and past curatorial staff. Additionally, minimally invasive examinations, such as testing the container or area around the object, as well as wipe tests, can be highly effective ways to look for contaminants.

Odegaard also advocated for tribal participation when testing potentially contaminated objects, and stressed the importance of this collaboration with tribal communities.

“When I’ve been doing testing, mostly, I will turn around and do it with [a tribal representative],” Odegaard explained. “And I’ll say, ‘You hold it, and we’ll do this together.’” (Hyperallergic, February 23, 2023) <https://hyperallergic.com/803145/harmful-pesticides-in-museum-collections-complicate-repatriation-efforts/>

EPA TACKLES ENDANGERED SPECIES DUTIES

When you find yourself in a hole, the first step to getting out is to stop digging.

Earlier this week, one EPA official said the agency has put down its proverbial shovel when it comes to ignoring its duties under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) when registering pesticides. Instead, he said, EPA is taking steps it hopes will ensure predictable pesticide access for growers while protecting threatened and endangered species and their habitat as required by law.

In comments delivered during the annual meeting of the Weed Science Society of America, Jake Li, EPA deputy assistant administrator for pesticide programs, acknowledged that the agency had registered and reregistered pesticides without going through the ESA process for decades. He cited the sheer volume of work - - determining the potential effects of hundreds of pesticide active ingredients on more than 1,600 threatened and endangered species -- as the main reason.

"We believe that over 95% of past pesticide decisions that should have complied with ESA never did," he said. "We literally have four decades of backlog to dig ourselves out of at this point."

In recent years, past failures to comply with ESA have led to a near-constant barrage of lawsuits against the EPA and the looming threat that courts could vacate pesticide registrations. Li said that recent court decisions have made it clear that lack of funding, staff or an efficient process to complete the ESA process will not be an excuse moving forward.

"Neither Congress nor the courts are going to swoop in and magically make this issue disappear," he said. "I think without real progress through an administrative solution, what we're going to continue to see is wildlife that are not going to get the full protections they're going to need. We're going to see hundreds of pesticides that remain legally vulnerable to lawsuits, and we're going to see growers continue to face considerable uncertainty about whether the pesticides they rely on will remain available on the market or instead be abruptly removed by a court order."

PROPOSED PATH FORWARD

Li outlined the agency's recent efforts to reduce litigation and ultimately bring the pesticide registration process in compliance with its ESA obligations. He noted that, in January 2022, EPA adopted a policy for registering new conventional pesticide active ingredients, evaluating their potential effects on listed species and initiating ESA consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, "as appropriate."

"In other words, we're just going to follow the law," Li said. "We're not going to create more uncertainty for growers by continuing to register new active ingredients without a path to bring them into compliance with the Endangered Species Act."

Toward that end, in April 2022, EPA released its ESA workplan detailing which actions it would prioritize for ESA compliance under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). In November, the agency published an updated workplan, highlighting

a "pick list" of 16 interim ecological mitigation measures intended to reduce spray drift and surface water runoff, minimizing pesticide exposure to endangered species.

The list included off-field conservation buffers, such as vegetative filter strips, grassed waterways and field borders; on-field conservation practices, including reduced tillage in the form of no-till and strip-till, as well as planting cover crops.

"In our minds, the best way we can show progress is by implementing this workplan and including some of the early mitigations," Li said. "We can do these things under FIFRA years before we ever go through the ESA process. What we need to demonstrate to our stakeholders, especially the environmental community, is that we can start protecting endangered species. You don't have to sue us in order for us to get there."

PARTNERS TO PROGRESS

Kyle Kunkler, director of government affairs for the American Soybean Association, acknowledged the gravity of the situation.

"Increasingly, the grower community is becoming aware that unless this issue is resolved and there is some sort of meaningful path forward identified, this is probably one of the largest, most existential issues to the ability of growers to access pesticides," he said while also speaking at the WSSA annual meeting. "So, the grower community is invested in helping to find a solution here."

While he applauded EPA's current efforts, Kunkler reminded the audience that it is pesticide users, such as his organization's 500,000 soybean farmers, who will bear the cost of implementing mitigation measures.

"The devil's in the details as to how things are implemented," he said. "If farmers are making sacrifices to protect the environment -- which I think you will find they are ready, willing and able to do -- they want to make sure that it is truly necessary and is going to benefit the species and their habitats the way the regulators intended."

Both Kunkler and Bill Chism, chair of WSSA's ESA committee, shared concern that as a group overall, pesticide users don't appreciate the ramifications of the EPA's latest approach. Their concern is not without merit. Though the updated ESA workplan has been available for public comment since mid-November, only 15 total comments have been submitted to the online docket as of Feb. 3, 2023. By contrast, the EPA's proposed changes to atrazine use garnered more than 68,000 comments last fall.

"I absolutely think growers don't know this is happening," Chism said. "I think farmers would be more than willing to help, but right now, they don't even know they're part of a discussion. Our committee is hoping to put together some communications pieces to help explain the Endangered Species Act."

Li added that if the EPA can show real progress, delivering real-world protections for endangered species while providing growers with the tools they need, he thinks there's a real chance litigation will subside.

"We're just really one court decision away from having our pesticide tools vacated and being pulled off the market abruptly," he said of the situation without the ESA workplan. "But I think right now is the best time in the history of this issue to actually make some progress. If we are sued, we have something to show the courts. If we all roll up our sleeves together, we can solve this problem once and hopefully for all."

(Progressive Farmer, February 5, 2023)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2023/02/05/epa-aims-predictable-pesticide>

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: 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 14, 2023

Title: SPOTTED LANTERNFLY CONTROL UPDATES

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):
1	2
1	3A
1	10

Date: March 20, 2023

Title: Forage Foundations Weed & Pest Control

Location: Haskell County contact for exact location

Contact: Crystal Shipman (918) 467-4330

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

Date: March 21, 2023

Title: Pest Management in Pastures and Hayfields (Forage Foundations Course 4)

Location: Pottawatomie County Extension contact for exact location

Contact: Michael Trammell (405) 273-7683

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

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](http://www.okpeanutcomm.org/upcoming-events.html)

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

Date: March 23, 2023

Title: BWI Pest Management Virtual Workshop Spring
2023
Location: Call for information
Contact: Tim Ruminer (405) 227-2985

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

Date: March 24, 2023

Title: BWI Pest & Lawn Seminar Spring 2023
Location: Call for location
Contact: Tim Ruminer (405) 227-2985

CEU's: Category(s):
2 3A
1 6
3 7A
2 7B
3 8
1 11A
1 11B

Date: March 24, 2023

Title: Heritage PPG Virtual Academy
Location: Virtual
Contact: Rachel Mohorn (828) 638-5798
<https://heritageppg.com/pages/academy>

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

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 17, 2023

Title: Sprayer Calibration
Location: Haskell County contact for exact location
Contact: Crystal Shipman (918) 467-4330

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

Date: April 27, 2023

Title: Weed Considerations in Poultry Litter
Location: Haskell County contact for exact location
Contact: Crystal Shipman (918) 467-4330

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

Date: April 27, 2023

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

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

Date: May 2, 2023

Title: Kansas Pest Control Association IPM for the Food
Industry
Location Virtual Zoom meeting
Contact: Jared Harris (785) 633-0192
<https://kpca.wildapricot.org/events>

CEU's: Category(s):
3 7A
4 7C

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



Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program



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

April 2023

When & Where?

8:00 am to 1:00 pm

DATE	April 25, 2023
COUNTY	Pittsburgh County
CITY	McAlester
LOCATION	Southeast Expo Center, 4500 West, 4500 US-270, McAlester, OK

What is the Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal program?

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

What are unwanted pesticides?

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

Who is eligible to participate and what does it cost?

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

- Liquid pesticide weighs about 10 pounds per gallon.

Will someone pick up my pesticides for me?

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

What are the steps to participate in the collection program?

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

Why are dealers asked to pre-register?

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

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

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

Contact Information:



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

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





Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal Program



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

April 2023

When & Where?

8:00 am to 1:00 pm

DATE

April 27, 2023

COUNTY

Kingfisher County

CITY

Kingfisher

LOCATION

Kingfisher County Fairgrounds, 300 South 13th St., Kingfisher, OK

What is the Oklahoma Unwanted Pesticide Disposal program?

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

What are unwanted pesticides?

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

Who is eligible to participate and what does it cost?

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

- Liquid pesticide weighs about 10 pounds per gallon.

Will someone pick up my pesticides for me?

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

What are the steps to participate in the collection program?

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

Why are dealers asked to pre-register?

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

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

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

Contact Information:



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

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

