

# PESTICIDE REPORTS

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



June, 2024

CHEM

- 1 JUNE TEST HELP WORKSHOPS
- 2 SYNGENTA OFFERING PARAQUAT TRAINING WEBINARS IN JUNE
- 2 EPA HALTS ACCEPTANCE OF DATA FOR PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FROM A NON-COMPLIANT LABORATORY
- 3 EPA PROPOSES TO REGISTER NEW HERBICIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENT GLUFOSINATE-P
- 5 US TRADE BODY INVESTIGATES 2,4-D CLAIM
- 6 UF RESEARCHERS EXAMINE HOW MUCH BAIT IT TAKES TO ELIMINATE A SUBTERRANEAN TERMITE COLONY
- 7 BAYER CALLS ROUNDUP LAWSUITS EXISTENTIAL THREAT TO COMPANY, FARMING
- 8 COMMENT PERIOD OPENS ON DICAMBA PRODUCT
- 10 CEU MEETINGS
- 10 ONLINE CEU LINKS
- 11 ODAFF TEST INFORMATION

## JUNE TEST HELP WORKSHOPS

The Oklahoma State University Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) has will be holding test help workshops June 11 in Oklahoma City and June 18 in Tulsa.

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

Registration cost is \$50 before June 9 for Oklahoma City and \$65 after June 9. Registration cost is \$50 before June 16 for Tulsa and \$65 after June 16. 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 2024 workshop dates can be found on the website as well.  
(OSU PSEP)

## SYNGENTA OFFERING PARAQUAT TRAINING WEBINARS IN JUNE

The Syngenta will hold five paraquat webinar trainings in June. This is one option to get the mandatory paraquat training to use paraquat. The date and times are listed below.

Dates	Times
June 05, 2024	2:00-3:00 PM EST
June 18, 2024	2:00-3:00 PM EST
June 20, 2024	2:00-3:00 PM EST
June 25, 2024	2:00-3:00 PM EST
June 26, 2024	2:00-3:00 PM EST

**The registration link will require the following: first and last name, email address, state, and certification license #. This will allow a report to be sent to EPA and to your state for certification credits (if applicable).**

There is a mandatory quiz at the end of the webinar that will be conducted thru zoom, so make sure trainees know to stay on until the end of the webinar.

Link to the training  
[https://syngenta.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_Gh1T5t4fTS-S3QbFJUJe-w#/registration](https://syngenta.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Gh1T5t4fTS-S3QbFJUJe-w#/registration)

For more information contact Bart Clewis at [bart.clewis@syngenta.com](mailto:bart.clewis@syngenta.com) for more information. (OSU PSEP)

## EPA HALTS ACCEPTANCE OF DATA FOR PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FROM A NON-COMPLIANT LABORATORY

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has halted the acceptance of studies generated by Palamur Biosciences Lab (Palamur) in Telangana, India, due to the possible falsification of data following an inspection by the Indian National Good Laboratory Practice Compliance Monitoring Authority (NGCMA). These data are typically submitted by pesticide registrants or applicants as part of the pesticide registration process. At this time, EPA is not accepting any studies from this lab, and registrants should not submit any new data from this lab.

Generally, EPA accepts studies from pesticide registrants for review as long as the conducting laboratory states that the studies follow Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) standards. EPA has the discretion to accept a non-GLP compliant study if the submitter provides a detailed statement as to why the studies were not conducted according to GLP standards, or provides sufficient rationale for why the study should be accepted despite not being conducted by a GLP lab. EPA information regarding data requirements for pesticide registration is [available online](#).

In May 2023, EPA reviewed two suspicious studies conducted at Palamur, which led our reviewer to conclude there was possible falsification of data. In response to this concern, [EPA's Good Laboratory Practice Standards Compliance Monitoring Program](#) raised this issue through the mechanism provided by the [Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's GLP workgroup and Mutual Acceptance of Data Program](#), which requested that the laboratory be inspected and 58 product chemistry and acute toxicity studies be audited. In July 2023, NGCMA conducted an inspection of Palamur and confirmed that data were falsified for most of those 58 studies, which were conducted between January 2020 and July 2023. NGCMA issued a 'Not in Compliance' status for the laboratory, which the Agency received in September 2023.

As a result, EPA is not currently accepting any data generated by Palamur and advises registrants to not submit any new data from this lab. Over the past several months, EPA has evaluated all pending submissions and determined that only one registrant has pending registration actions that rely on Palamur-generated product chemistry or acute toxicity data. EPA has contacted this registrant and informed them that they will need to replace the Palamur-conducted studies in order to meet the relevant data requirement(s) for registration. EPA will also be contacting the four companies that have existing registrations that rely on product chemistry or acute toxicity data generated by Palamur lab during this time-frame. EPA will work with each affected registrant to obtain appropriate replacement data or take other appropriate action such as cancellation or suspension.

The Agency will provide additional information if Palamur returns to GLP compliance and EPA determines that it will again accept data conducted by the laboratory.

(EPA, May 24, 2024)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-halts-acceptance-data-pesticide-registration-non-compliant-laboratory>

## **EPA PROPOSES TO REGISTER NEW HERBICIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENT GLUFOSINATE-P**

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released for public comment its proposed registration decision for pesticide products containing the new active ingredient glufosinate-P to control weeds in non-tolerant and glufosinate-resistant corn, sweet corn, soybean, cotton, and canola. In addition to its proposed registration decision, EPA has also released its draft biological evaluation for the pesticide under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

This action complies with EPA's obligations under the ESA and furthers the goals outlined in EPA's [April 2022 ESA Workplan](#) by identifying potential effects to listed

species and proposing protective measures prior to new conventional active ingredient pesticide registration. EPA is proposing several mitigation measures to reduce exposure to non-target species. Those measures are expected to minimize impacts to federally endangered and threatened (listed) species and their designated critical habitats. Glufosinate-P is the fourth new conventional active ingredient EPA has proposed to register that complies with the ESA.

### **Background on Glufosinate-P**

Glufosinate-P, an isomer of the currently registered herbicide glufosinate, is a non-selective herbicide that kills plants by causing excess ammonia build-up and directly inhibiting photosynthesis.

EPA received applications for both glufosinate-P and its ammonium salt, glufosinate-P ammonium. Glufosinate-P ammonium and glufosinate-P will generally exist in the same form in the environment and share the same herbicidal properties. Therefore, the Agency considers glufosinate-P to be the active ingredient for both forms under the proposed registration decision. EPA is proposing to register several glufosinate-P and glufosinate-P-ammonium products for manufacturing and commercial distribution.

Glufosinate-P has similar benefits and uses to the currently registered glufosinate herbicide products. These benefits include flexible application timing, which allows for postemergence weed control over the top of glufosinate-tolerant crops and for early season use in non-tolerant canola, corn, cotton, and soybean. The proposed glufosinate-P products result in less chemicals entering the environment compared to the currently registered glufosinate. Glufosinate-P only contains the herbicidally active part of glufosinate, so glufosinate-P applications require approximately half the application rate compared to glufosinate.

### **Results of EPA's Risk Assessments**

Before issuing this proposed registration decision, EPA evaluated the potential hazardous effects and exposures to human health and the environment, as required by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Based on the Agency's human health risk

assessment, the proposed uses of glufosinate-P have no human health risks. However, EPA's ecological draft risk assessment identified risks for terrestrial and aquatic plants and chronic risk to mammals, bees, and non-bee terrestrial invertebrates that forage in treated fields and may be exposed to residues on food items exposed to off-site spray drift.

### Proposed Mitigations

EPA is proposing the following mitigation measures under FIFRA and ESA to address on- and off-field effects to non-target species, including the endangered Spring Creek bladderpod plant:

- Restricting application in Wilson County, TN between September 1st and May 1st, and when Spring Creek bladderpod is present on agricultural fields.
- Prohibiting application during rainfall and when soils are saturated or above field capacity.
- Requiring users to visit EPA's Mitigation Menu Website before application and determine an appropriate strategy for meeting or exceeding the required number of mitigation points as specified on the menu.
- Maintaining a 50 foot in-field downwind buffer between the last spray row and the protection area for aerial application.
- Where possible, using methods that reduce soil erosion and pesticide runoff, including no till, limited till, and contour plowing; and
- Instructing users to access and follow any applicable endangered species bulletin from "[Bulletins Live! Two](#)" web-based system for all additional directions and restrictions.

With these proposed mitigations in place, EPA's draft biological evaluation predicts that the use of glufosinate-P will not result in a likelihood of future jeopardy for the survival of any listed species, or a likelihood of adverse modification for any designated critical habitat. EPA will also consider whether the August 2024 Herbicide Strategy Framework applies to this proposed registration, before issuing any final registration.

### Next Steps

After considering public comments on the proposed registration and the draft effects determinations, EPA will determine whether the registration action meets the FIFRA standard and ESA obligations. If EPA determines that the registration action can be granted, EPA will finalize the biological evaluation. If a final biological evaluation continues to find that glufosinate-P may affect any listed species or critical habitats, then EPA will initiate ESA consultation and share its findings with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service (collectively referred to as the Services), as appropriate.

During any formal consultation, the Services use the information in EPA's final biological evaluation to inform their biological opinions. While EPA has made predictions about the potential likelihood of future jeopardy/adverse modification as part of its biological evaluation, the Services are responsible for making the actual final jeopardy/adverse modification findings and have the sole authority to do so. If the Services determine in their final biological opinions that additional mitigations are necessary to address any jeopardy/adverse modification determination or to address any unintentional harm known as incidental take, then EPA will work with the registrant to ensure that any necessary registration or labeling changes are made.

To read more about the proposed registration of glufosinate-P and to comment, see docket ID [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0250](#) at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). The public comment period will be open for 30 days, closing on June 8, 2024.

All the supporting documents related to glufosinate-P are available in [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0250](#). Please note that draft labels for BASF products are available in [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0250](#) and the draft labels for MCCLS products are available in [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0533](#).

(EPA, May 9, 2024)

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-proposes-register-new-herbicide-active-ingredient-glufosinate-p>

## US TRADE BODY INVESTIGATES 2,4-D CLAIM

Anti-dumping and countervailing duties on 2,4-D imports from China and India moved one step closer to approval Friday as the U.S. International Trade Commission voted to continue investigating in response to a petition filed by Corteva Agribusiness LLC in March.

Corteva claimed in its petition filed on March 14, 2024, that 2,4-D imports from China and India were injuring or threatening to injure the U.S. ag chemical industry.

Corteva said in its original petition that producers of the herbicide from the two countries were exporting subsidized products into the U.S. Dumping takes place when a foreign producer sells a product in the U.S. at a price below a producer's sale price in its country of origin.

During a public hearing on the petition, the National Corn Growers Association expressed opposition to duties for fear they could lead to higher prices and shortages for U.S. farmers.

"We are disappointed that ITC did not listen to the feedback from farmers about how harmful these tariffs could be to rural America," Minnesota farmer and NCGA President Harold Wolle said in a statement. "Corn prices are already low and input costs have been rising. This decision will only compound our problems."

According to a news release from the commission Friday, the U.S. Department of Commerce's preliminary countervailing duty determinations are due on or about June 27, 2024, and its preliminary antidumping duty determinations on or about Sept. 10, 2024.

NCGA said in a news release that imports "covered by this case are the major sources of supply other than Corteva, which is the only U.S. manufacturer, and that America's farmers cannot rely upon a sole domestic supplier of 2,4-D to meet nearly all the market's needs."

NCGA said duties on 2,4-D imports from China and India "would intensify what is already a difficult period"

for many growers as key input costs continue to increase.

USDA has projected record-high farm production cash expenses for 2024. At the same time, USDA has projected total cash receipts for crops in 2024 to be 11.7% lower than in 2022.

Corteva did not respond to DTN's request for comment at press time.

"NCGA intends to continue to engage in this case as it goes to the next stage, including the final phase at the U.S. International Trade Commission early next year," NCGA said in a statement.

According to Corteva's petition, Chinese and Indian 2,4-D made up 81% of the chemical's imports into the U.S. Corteva is the sole U.S. producer of 2,4-D.

That petition estimates the dumping margin for 2,4-D is between 142% and 388% for China and 55% to 139% for India. Because of the dumping, Corteva said, U.S. producers "continually lost sales and revenues" and that led to Corteva's lost market share and declining sales.

On April 18, 2024, the NCGA, along with the National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, National Sorghum Producers, U.S. Durum Growers Association and the American Soybean Association, sent a letter to David S. Johanson, chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission, asking him to vote against the petition.

"Given the significant burden these proposed tariffs would place on America's farmers and rural communities, including supply shortages and delays, we encourage you to vote negative at the preliminary stage of this investigation on Corteva's petition," the groups said.

"Corteva's material damage, as claimed by the company, does not come close to the harm this case will cause American farmers."

(Progressive Farmer, May 17, 2024)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/art>

## UF RESEARCHERS EXAMINE HOW MUCH BAIT IT TAKES TO ELIMINATE A SUBTERRANEAN TERMITE COLONY

A team of students from the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) determined that less is more when it comes to just how many members of a subterranean termite colony must consume a chemical known as a chitin synthesis inhibitor (CSI) before the colony is eliminated.

The [study](#), published in the Journal of Pest Science, takes a closer look at how much bait it takes to eliminate a subterranean colony.

As a prominent industry standard used in bait systems, CSI baits were first commercially used in the mid-1990s. Bait systems work as slow-acting agents. Current commercial formulations can provide a cost-effective and sustainable solution against potential damage from subterranean termites.

“If termites feed on the bait, it can lead to colony elimination in a few months, as University of Florida researchers have demonstrated in the past three decades through dozens of keystone studies,” said Thomas Chouvenc, an assistant professor of urban entomology at the UF/IFAS Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center (REC).

“One of the remaining questions we had was, how many termites feeding on the bait does it take to reach colony elimination?” said Johnalyn Gordon, who recently graduated from UF/IFAS with a master’s degree.

“From a previous study in our lab, we knew that it only takes a day of termites feeding on bait to reach a colony-wide lethal dose, but how many termites within the colony need to actively feed on the bait remained

unclear,” added Joseph Velenovsky, a doctoral candidate at UF/IFAS Fort Lauderdale REC.

Both students, under the supervision of Chouvenc, worked with 1.68 million termites at the Fort Lauderdale REC to answer this question.

“They used 27 large colonies of termites that the team spent four years rearing in the lab, with approximately 62,500 termites in each of them,” explained Chouvenc.

“It was quite a task to accomplish to show that food sharing behaviors of the bait were happening at the termite colony level, from just a fraction of foragers,” Chouvenc said.

The efforts of the graduate student duo paid off. They were able to determine that it takes less than 5% of the entire termite population of a colony feeding on a bait station for a short duration to reach colony elimination.

More critically, they demonstrated that it only takes 77 milligrams of a termite-specific pesticide to eliminate one million termites, confirming that CSI termite baits remain the most environmentally-friendly termite control technology available.

“It was remarkable to observe that only a small portion of foragers feeding on bait was sufficient to kill the colonies,” Velenovsky said.

“Even more remarkable, if a small number of workers feed on a tiny amount of bait for just a few days, the colony has already reached a ‘point of no return’ and is doomed to be eliminated within 90 days,” explained Gordon.

The study concluded that even if subterranean termites can be seen in bait stations for up to three months, the colony is technically already in the process of dying within the first week, even after a small number of termites feed on it.

“If the termites feed on the bait, they are already dead, but they don’t know it yet,” concluded Gordon.

(PCT, April 24, 2024)

<https://www.pctonline.com/news/new-research-reinforces-cockroach-sanitation-link/>

## **BAYER CALLS ROUNDUP LAWSUITS EXISTENTIAL THREAT TO COMPANY, FARMING**

Bayer AG Chief Executive Officer Bill Anderson said the wave of lawsuits over its Roundup weedkiller is an “existential” threat to the company and farmers, ratcheting up the stakes as it considers a controversial legal maneuver.

“The glyphosate litigation topic is an existential topic for our company because it does threaten to remove our ability to continue to innovate for farmers and for food security,” Anderson said in a speech at the Executives’ Club of Chicago on Thursday, referring to Roundup’s key ingredient.

Bayer is considering whether to use a legal tactic dubbed the Texas Two-Step bankruptcy, in an attempt to settle tens of thousands of U.S. lawsuits claiming Roundup causes cancer, people familiar with the company’s thinking told Bloomberg in March. Bayer has vigorously defended its claim that glyphosate and glyphosate-based formulations are safe, and the chemical remains in widespread use across much of the world.

The CEO’s comments show that Bayer is trying to broaden its defense beyond the courtroom, where it has lost a number of U.S. cases from users of the herbicide who claimed it caused cancer, which the company has steadfastly denied. The company argues that without such products, the world will be unable to feed a growing population.

Anderson’s predecessor, Werner Baumann, generally stopped short of warning that the company’s existence was threatened, even as the legal woes mounted. Bayer has set aside \$16 billion to resolve Roundup suits. About

\$10 billion of that reserve has been spent so far, a company spokesman said.

### **Texas Two-Step bankruptcy**

The Texas Two-Step gets its name from the use of a state law that lets companies split their assets and liabilities into separate units, then place the part loaded with liabilities into bankruptcy to drive a global settlement.

Such a move, if successful, could permit other parts of Bayer, a major pharmaceutical and consumer health company, to keep operating normally. But courts have rejected the tactic by 3M Co. over suits targeting faulty hearing protection devices for U.S. soldiers and by Johnson & Johnson in litigation tied to its talc-based baby powder.

Bayer agreed to transition from the glyphosate-based version of Roundup to new active weed-killing ingredients in the U.S. consumer market by the end of last year. The company still sells glyphosate-based herbicides for agricultural markets, however, and the European Union late last year authorized sales for another decade.

Anderson in his speech called the glyphosate lawsuits without merit and bad for the company and the employees who have lost their jobs as a result.

The chemical conglomerate is spending more on lawsuits than the 2.4 billion euros (\$2.6 billion) a year spent on R&D, the CEO said. He said Bayer is the largest R&D investor in agriculture, and the legal issues put at risk the progress needed to feed an exploding world population by mid-century with less water and land.

### **Farming costs**

“This is actually something very serious for American agriculture,” Anderson said. “It’s been estimated that the cost of groceries for the average family of four in the U.S. would go up by more than 40% if glyphosate were removed from the agriculture system.”

Crops genetically modified to withstand the application of glyphosate weedkiller account for almost all of the corn and soybean plantings in the U.S. and Brazil.

Anderson said that despite the U.S.'s scientific and regulatory communities giving a green light to glyphosate, the company is still subject to billions of dollars every year in lawsuits. Bayer inherited the Roundup lawsuits through its 2018 purchase of agriculture behemoth Monsanto for \$63 billion.

The German company's shares have lost more than 70% of their value since the Monsanto purchase, and they were down a further 1.3% early on Friday in Frankfurt.

Investor concern has grown about Bayer's liability, eventually leading to the departure of Baumann. In addition to the legal woes, the company has been grappling with other problems including a weak drug pipeline and high debt.

(Farm Progress, May 24, 2024)

<https://www.farmprogress.com/business/bayer-calls-roundup-lawsuits-existential-threat-to-company-farming>

## **COMMENT PERIOD OPENS ON DICAMBA PRODUCT**

A proposed label for KHNP0090, a dicamba herbicide from Bayer formerly known as XtendiMax, would remove any over-the-top (OTT) application of the herbicide in soybeans and restrict its use to no later than June 12 in that crop.

On May 3, EPA published a notice of receipt in the Federal Register and announced the start of a 30-day public comment period for KHNP0090 containing the active ingredient dicamba for use on tolerant soybeans and cotton. The agency stated that because the application involves a new use pattern for dicamba, it is required to provide a 30-day public comment period on the registration application consistent with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide ACT (FIFRA).

EPA also seeks comment on the associated draft labeling that was submitted by Bayer, which is available here: <https://www.regulations.gov/...>

The proposed label would allow applications to dicamba-tolerant soybeans made pre-plant, at planting or immediately after planting. No application would be allowed post-emergence or later than June 12. In dicamba-tolerant cotton, the proposed label allows for applications at-plant, pre-plant, pre-emergence and post-emergence over the top of the cotton, but no applications would be allowed later than July 30. This use in cotton mirrors the previous label for XtendiMax that was vacated.

The newly proposed label also reduces the maximum annual rate from 88 ounces to 44 ounces in both soybeans and cotton. The product formulation for KHNP0090 is the same as its predecessor.

The action by EPA comes nearly eight weeks after Bayer announced that it had initiated the registration process for its dicamba product for use in dicamba-tolerant soybeans and cotton in 2025. That move came about a month after a federal court in Arizona vacated the 2020 registrations of three OTT dicamba products previously approved by EPA -- including XtendiMax, BASF's Engenia and Syngenta's Tavium.

The court's action led EPA to issue an existing stocks order for the 2024 season on Feb. 14, allowing for the use of the herbicides already distributed from the product registrants following application cutoff dates on previously approved labels.

In a statement sent to DTN, a Bayer spokesperson said that the company was "doing everything we can to get the best possible label for growers for 2025 and beyond.

"We stand fully behind the technology and believe growers should continue to have access to vital crop-protection tools," the spokesperson wrote. "In preparation for the 2025 season, Bayer made a new submission to the EPA to register a low-volatility dicamba product for use with dicamba-tolerant soy and cotton. Our new submission includes some proposed label changes, which we believe are necessary to achieve an EPA approval in time for the 2025 season.

"The next steps in this registration process are up to the EPA," the spokesperson continued. "We hope the EPA will continue to move swiftly so growers have access to



the technology in time for the 2025 season. We encourage growers and others to participate in this public comment period to help explain the importance of the technology.

"Meanwhile, it will be very important that growers and applicators have another successful season with over-the-top dicamba use in 2024. As always, label compliance is absolutely essential and required by law," the spokesperson emphasized.

Initial reaction to the proposed dicamba product label by soybean growers wasn't entirely positive.

"We are greatly concerned there is no post-emergent option for soybeans in this proposal," said Alan Meadows, a soybean farmer from Tennessee and American Soybean Association director, in a statement. "While we appreciate that work is underway on a new registration and the certainty it will provide supply chains, soybean farmers need a post-emergent dicamba option.

"Herbicide-resistant palmer amaranth and other devastating weeds can destroy a crop and have already developed resistance to most or all the post-emergent alternatives to which soybean farmers have access," he said. "Without post-emergent dicamba, tens of thousands of U.S. soybean farmers are sitting ducks."

Critics of OTT dicamba products immediately spoke out against any new label.

"This is a farce. Virtually nothing in this application addresses the concerns the public and the courts have about this destructive pesticide," said Nathan Donley, environmental health science director at the Center for Biological Diversity, in a press release. "Bayer's cynical attempt to push through another illegal dicamba approval is obviously terrible for the environment, but it's also bad for farmers, who keep getting jerked around by the promise of another registration that's destined for failure. The EPA should stop this once and for all with a quick, decisive denial."

Bill Freese, science director at the Center for Food Safety, also condemned the registration attempt.

"EPA has had seven long years of massive drift damage to learn that dicamba cannot be used safely with genetically engineered (GE) dicamba-resistant crops," he said. "Nothing Bayer might say or do can redeem this inherently hazardous GE crop system. EPA must deny this application to spare thousands of farmers further massive losses and to avert still more rural strife between dicamba users and victims of its rampant drift."

The last day to submit a comment regarding the proposed registration and label for KHNP0090 is June 3, 2024.

(Progressive Farmer, May 3, 2024)

<https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/crops/article/2024/05/03/proposed-bayer-dicamba-label-removes>

## CEU Meetings

Please note that some of these meetings are virtual using Zoom or Microsoft Teams. Please contact the meeting host directly if you have any questions.

### Date: June 4, 2024

Title: Oklahoma State University 2024 Cross Timbers Forest & Range Management Field Day

Location: Contact for Location

Contact: Ryan DeSantis (405) 744-5463

CEU's:	Category(s):
3	2
3	10

### Date: June 7, 2024

Title: Payne County Pasture Tour

Location: Contact Payne County office for Location

Contact: Nathan Anderson (405) 747-8320

CEU's:	Category(s):
4	Private
4	1A
4	10
1	A

### Date: October 1, 2024

Title: ENSYSTEEX 2024 Workshop

Location: TBA Tulsa OK

Contact: Don Stetler (281) 217-2965

<https://ceuworkshop.com/>

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

## ODAFF Approved Online CEU Course Links

### Online Pest Control Courses

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

### PestED.com

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

### Certified Training Institute

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

### WSU URBAN IPM AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

### CEU University

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

### Technical Learning College

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

### All Star Pro Training

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

### Wood Destroying Organism Inspection Course

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

### CTN Educational Services Inc

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

### Pest Network

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

### Veseris

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

### AG CEU Online

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

### Target Specialty Products Online Training

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

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>

## ODAFF Test Information

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

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

**Reservation must be made in advance** at [www.psiexams.com/](http://www.psiexams.com/) or call **855-579-4643**

### PSI locations.

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

Tulsa 2816 East 51st Street, Suite 101, Tulsa, OK  
74105

McAlester 21 East Carl Albert Parkway (US Hwy 270),  
McAlester, Oklahoma 74501

Woodward 1915 Oklahoma Ave, Suite 3, Woodward,  
OK 73801

Lawton Great Plains Technology Center, 4500 West  
Lee Blvd Building 300- RM 308, Lawton, OK 73505

Enid Autry Technology Center, 1201 W. Willow Rd,  
Enid, OK 73703

Ponca City Pioneer Technology Center, 2101 N Ash,  
Ponca City, OK 74601

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

Kevin Shelton  
405-744-1060 [kevin.shelton@okstate.edu](mailto:kevin.shelton@okstate.edu) or

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

**Pesticide Safety  
Education Program**