

2
TA 265.6
C42
97/01



Texas Agricultural
Extension Service
The Texas A&M
University System

CHEMOGRAM

Government Publications
Texas State Documents
FEB 10 1997
Depository
Dallas Public Library

Urban Applicator Training Schedule for 1997 Don L. Renchie

We had a good year as the number of training programs conducted by our office increased 100%. There were 16 SPCB Applicator certification programs offered, at which 720 applicators received training. Also, with your assistance, we offered 13 IPM Coordinator Certification programs, at which 289 Coordinators were certified. In addition to these applicator certification programs, we offered 11 Applicator CEU programs, 8 for urban applicators and 3 for agricultural applicators, in which approximately 1100 applicators received continuing education credits as required by TDA and the SPCB.

These activities could not have been conducted without the assistance of each of you at the county level. THANKS for your dedication to the constituents in your respective counties and districts.

With such a successful year behind us, it is now time to plan for 1997. Please review the following schedules and make them available to applicators and other interested persons in your area.

Structural Training Dates

Don L. Renchie, Extension Associate, will conduct 1997 certification training for structural technicians, and noncommercial and commercial applicators on the following dates:

| <u>DATE OF TRAINING</u> | <u>LOCATION</u> | <u>REGISTRATION DEADLINE</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| January 15 | Dallas | January 1 |
| February 19 | Austin | February 5 |
| March 19 | Houston | March 5 |
| April 16 | El Paso | April 2 |
| May 21 | Dallas | May 7 |
| June 18 | Austin | June 4 |
| July 16 | Houston | July 2 |
| August 20 | Corpus Christi | August 6 |
| September 17 | Dallas | September 3 |
| October 22 | Lubbock | October 8 |
| November 19 | Houston | November 5 |
| December 17 | San Antonio | December 3 |

IPM Training Dates

The Texas Association of School Boards, Inc. (TASB, Inc.) will host the following environmental training courses in Austin:

- Integrated Pest Management Coordinator Training
February 12 9 a.m. - 4 p.m.
- Noncommercial Applicator Review Training
May 7 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

Again, thanks for ALL of your hard work and lets make 1997 a banner year for the Extension Applicator Training Programs.

Pesticide Applicator Training: A Wrap on 1996 by Suzanne Deatherage

Most of the following information has been announced via e-mail and correspondence. It's provided here as a year-end summary of 1996 PAT developments. All items pertain to agricultural PAT, rather than structural, except where noted.

1 **Upcoming deadline:** All 1996 course rosters must be received by the Texas Department of Agriculture by **January 10, 1997**. Remember: typed or legible, hand-printed course rosters (D-1431 preferred) may be sent *directly* to TDA (attn: recertification rosters), PO Box 12847, Austin TX 78711. Rosters are no longer accepted at the Extension Data Center nor do they need to be sent through the Agricultural and Environmental Safety office.

2. **Upcoming expiration date:** Approval for dual use of the private applicator *certification* program and video (VHS 960) for recertification (course 2350) expires **December 31, 1996**. Course 2388 -- the 1994 Pesticide Applicator Recertification Satellite Conference videotape (VHS 898) --also will expire. Neither will be renewed as a future CEU course.

3. Publication B-1648, *Using Pesticides: Private Applicator Manual*, is still available to Extension faculty at no charge (with supplies expected to last through 1997). The \$10 fee was waived so that you could collect it locally to support your pesticide applicator training program. Order with D-1 or D-1405. Limit 75 per order.

4. The authority of Extension faculty to issue continuing education units (CEUs) without prior approval from TDA was raised from a limit of two CEUs to a limit of three CEUs per day per applicator. Remember: the ratio of instruction time per CEU must be one-to-one and the content must be relevant to pesticide use. Noncompliance may lead to suspension of your three-CEU authority.

5. County Extension agents in agriculture were recognized as CEU providers for commercial / noncommercial applicators, as well as private applicators. This eliminated the distinction between courses known as "8888" and "6666." Henceforth, for courses of three CEUs or less, use the appropriate formula below to establish your own course number:

* *For county-based faculty:* Use 8 + three-digit Extension county code. Example: Anderson County = 8001.

* *For district-based faculty:* Use 8 + three-digit Extension district code. Example: District 1 = 8601.

* *For campus-based faculty:* Use 8 + three-digit Extension unit code. Example: Agricultural Engineering = 8730.

6. Recertification of private pesticide applicators continues to require 15 CEUs every five years. However, *the 15 CEUs must include two CEUs in IPM* (up from one) beginning with license cycles that started January 1, 1996, or after. The requirement for two CEUs in laws and regulations remains unchanged.

7. Commercial / noncommercial applicators must obtain five CEUs annually, including two separate units from any of three required topics: IPM, laws and regulations, or drift minimization, a 1996 addition.

8. Under the Texas Structural Pest Control Board, CEUs are required of commercial / noncommercial applicators on an annual basis. The requirement calls for two CEUs on "general" topics, with at least one on IPM, safety or laws and regulations. In addition, another CEU is required for each category in which the applicator is licensed (termite, fumigation, etc.)

9. Both TDA and the SPCB discontinued tracking the CEUs of their licensees in 1996. Now, in a process called "self-certification," applicators receive a license renewal form from their licensing agency. On the form there is a place to document acquired CEUs. It is essential that trainers issue a certificate of completion and that recipients keep the certificate in their own CEU file.

Private applicator certification CAN be automated

Although a live presentation is always better, the certification training for private applicators can be given to individuals for self study in a monitored setting (usually your office). By law, it may NOT be given as a take-home program.

There are two versions of the certification training: the original with slide sets and a 1995 videotape with teacher's guide, both of which are accompanied by the B-1648 manual. While the slide sets are outdated, they'll remain usable until we revise the manual.

Many agents prefer the updated video-based program for groups. However, if class size does not warrant a live presentation, here's an easy way to "automate" the program. Simply provide the trainee with a manual and *Note-Taking Worksheet*, which came with the teacher's guide. Have the trainee watch the video and read the manual, completing the worksheet as he goes. Afterward, check the worksheet for a good faith effort, rather than correct answers, since the trainee will keep these materials. Top off with the same spiel you would with the slide sets and you're both done!

In a past newsletter, I offered suggestions for saving time during the live format. Whether you're using a live or automated format, feel free to contact me about customizing the program to best suit your situation.

New Labeling Requirements Promote Safer Use of Pesticide Products on Cats And Dogs by Doug Stevenson

EPA is requiring improved label directions on pesticide products (such as flea and tick dips, sprays, powders and collars) used on cats and dogs to reduce risk to pets as well as the pet owners. The new requirements include more specific use directions aimed at ensuring that pet pesticide products are used safely, reducing potential adverse effects on animals and people. Reports of adverse effects from veterinarians, consumers and manufacturers of pet pesticide products have indicated that improved labeling is necessary.

EPA's revised policies reflect comments received on a draft proposal issued last year. Since that time, EPA has been working with the Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, public interest groups and other interested parties to improve the label language on these pet products. To promote safer use of these products, the following are some of the label statements that will be required on all pesticide products used on cats and dogs:

- Read the entire label before each use.
- Use only on cats (and/or dogs as appropriate).
- Do not reapply product for (insert number of days, weeks, months).
- Do not repeat treatment for (insert number of days, weeks, or months).
- Do not use on (dogs or cats) under 12 weeks (only a few products can support use for cats or dogs under age 12).
- Consult a veterinarian before using this product on debilitated, aged, pregnant or nursing animals.
- Sensitivities may occur after using any pesticide product for pets. If signs of sensitivity occur, bathe your pet with mild soap and rinse with large amounts of water. If signs continue, consult a veterinarian immediately.

The new regulations are contained in a notice issued to pesticide registrants, manufacturers and formulators (PR Notice 96-6). All cat and dog pesticide products released after Oct. 1, 1998 must include the additional statements outlined in the notice. Reporters can obtain a copy of the PR notice from Al Heier at 202-260-4374. Others can call the Office of Pesticide Programs Communications Branch at 703-305-5017.

Spray Drift Minimization by Bryan W. Shaw

Spray drift has many adverse effects including environmental damage, off-target damage, poor pest control, wasted chemical, and damaged public perception. Drift is defined as "the movement of chemicals outside the intended target by air mass transport or diffusion" by American Society of Agricultural Engineers standard ASAE S327.2. Drift can occur by two methods: vapor drift and particle drift. The following information will help you reduce the potential for particle drift while applying agricultural chemicals.

Small particles are more likely to drift, especially particles less than 100 µm (micrometers) in diameter. For good spray coverage and reduced drift, particles 300-600 µm in diameter are typically desired. Small particles fall slowly and are easily carried off-target by even a gentle breeze. High temperatures and low relative humidity may result in evaporation of spray droplets resulting in smaller particles of chemical solution that are easily carried off-target.

The following tips will help minimize the potential for spray drift:

1. Select pesticides with low volatility to reduce vapor drift.
2. Read and follow the pesticide label. Remember, approximately 65% of drift complaints involve application in violation of the label.
3. Avoid spraying with susceptible areas down wind or when the wind speed is above 10 miles per hour. (5mph when applying regulated herbicides).
4. Consider leaving a 200-300 ft buffer zone between field being sprayed and sensitive area.
5. Best to spray early and late in the day when winds die down, temperatures are low, and relative humidity is high. Use additional caution when relative humidity is below 50%.
6. Consider using larger orifice sizes to increase droplet size.
7. Operate at the lower end of the recommended pressure range with a low boom height. Keep boom just high enough to assure proper coverage.
8. Consider using drift reduction nozzles to produce larger droplets.
9. Consider using drift control additives "thickeners". If used properly, can reduce drift 50-80%. If not used properly, can cause non-uniform spray pattern and/or incorrect application rate.
10. Use shields to reduce drift caused by wind.

Texas Poultry Pest Control Survey by Kent Hall

The following are some of the results of the poultry pest control survey we conducted in 1996. A full report should be available in the spring of 1997 in the form of an Extension publication.

Two hundred forty-one Texas poultry producers completed a questionnaire. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents were chicken broiler producers, 9% turkey broiler producers, 7% breeder broiler producers, 4% pullet broiler producers, 3% commercial egg producers of which 2% were breeders of commercial egg layers, 2% were producers of commercial egg pullets, and 1% were broiler egg producers.

Texas poultry production is concentrated in two areas of the state. The largest concentrations are in the East and North Extension Districts. One hundred eighteen of the survey respondents' poultry operations are in Shelby and Nacogdoches counties. A smaller concentration of poultry operations is in the Southwest and Coastal Bend Extension Districts. Thirty producers from Gonzales county responded to the survey.

Fire ants, mice, darkling beetles, house flies, and rats were a problem in 94%, 84%, 83%, 71%, and 65% of the poultry

operations, respectively. Darkling beetles, black flies, and varmints were a problem for a larger percentage of the respondents in the East and North East areas of the State than those in the Southwest and Coastal Bend areas. Forty-seven percent of all the producers suffered some economic loss due to fire ants in 1996.

Thirty-two percent of all respondents said that control of pests was an important part of their poultry operation. Sixty-four percent said that it was very important. Eighty-one percent used some type of insecticide to protect birds or poultry facilities from insect pests.

Destroy or remove dead birds, manure management, keep feeders and waterers sanitary, control weeds to reduce flies, and thorough cleaning between flocks were non-chemical pest control practices used by 93%, 86%, 80%, 75%, and 63% of the respondents.

Iodine and pouphene were most popular disinfectants poultry producers used. Few listed chemical products they applied directly on the birds or incorporated in the feed. Of those who did report chemical products applied directly on the birds Sevin® dust was used most often. Larvadex® was the primary pest control feed additive given. A variety of products were listed for controlling pests on the premises. Sevin® was reported by 32% of the survey respondents, Diazinon and Terminator® by 29%, Tempo® by 15%, other insecticides by 19%, rodenticides by 11%, and fire ant products by 10%. Roundup® was the primary herbicide used by the poultry producers (35%).

A majority of the producers (58%) used personal observation of damage or infestation level to determine when to apply insecticides to control pests. Thirty-six percent used an established preventative program and 6% used both methods.

Company field service personnel were clearly the main source producers relied on most for information on control of pests (84% of the respondents). Neighbor - other poultry producers (48%) was second and Extension Service (24%) was third.

The top three needs with respect to pest control of the Texas poultry producers who responded to this survey were given as: products that provide lasting control (67% of respondents), products that provide more effective control (63%), and less expensive products (53%).

The Food Quality Protection Agency of 1996 Has Many Implications for Agriculture by Rodney L. Holloway & Don L. Rennie

Of special interest to Texas, the new law contains a provision that requires EPA to establish a time-limited tolerance when the Agency grants an exemption from FIFRA, as allowed under section 18. The Office of Pesticide Programs is working to establish criteria for screening incoming section 18 requests, both specific and crisis, to ensure that the provisions of the new law are met.

It is important for states to recognize that emergency specific and crisis exemptions also require the establishment of a time-limited tolerance. If it is determined that a crisis exemption is absolutely necessary, **please contact EPA first**. The Agency will make a preliminary decision based on best judgement as to whether it believes establishment of a tolerance is possible before the proposed treated commodity enters into commerce. EPA expects that it may take between three and four weeks from receipt of the crisis declaration for the tolerance to be established. States and growers should understand that EPA's decision to allow a crisis does not guarantee that a tolerance will be established at a later date. Therefore, EPA strongly encourages states to use crisis authority with extreme caution.

The new legislation requires the Agency to consider certain factors when reviewing Section 18 applications. In addition to those previously considered, each of the following factors must be considered, individually and in combination, for impacts on cumulative risk from multiple exposure pathways.

- ▶ Is there evidence that the RFD may not be sufficient to adequately protect infants and children?
- ▶ Is the chemical a carcinogen?
- ▶ Is there a dietary concern from treated foods?
- ▶ Is there potential for transfer of residues to drinking water?
- ▶ Is the chemical an acute toxicant?
- ▶ Is there any information for this pesticide regarding a common mode of action with other pesticides?

In order for EPA to be able to continue to screen incoming Section 18 requests, they will need the information relevant to the new factors listed above. To avoid unnecessary delays in processing Section 18 requests, it is recommended that states include the following additional information in any section 18 request they submit to EPA:

“Points of Light”

1. Is there a possibility that the chemical may transfer to or be found in drinking water? Based on available information, the discussion should include, but not be limited to, information indicating if the pesticide is persistent and/or mobile, relevant product chemistry, and available modeling. Further, information concerning State drinking water monitoring programs should be provided (ie. Does the State routinely monitor for the pesticide? Has it been detected? What are the detection limits? etc.)
2. Are there any residential uses of the chemical? If so, please provide information on these uses, including, but not limited to application sites, rates and formulations used.
3. Is there any information for this pesticide regarding a common mode of action with other pesticides?
4. When will the crop be harvested?

If any of the aforementioned information is not readily available, the state should contact the manufacturer of the chemical. In most cases, this information is available and can be accessed by the company and supplied to your state agency.

If you have questions, please feel free to call Mark Trostle at the TDA, at (512) 463-7407 or Rob Forrest at the EPA, at (703) 308-8417.

The information given herein is for educational purposes only. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Extension Service is implied. Educational programs of the Extension Service are open to all citizens without regard to race, color, sex, disability, age or national origin.



Don L. Renschie
Extension Associate
101 Agronomy Field Lab
College Station, Texas 77843-2488