

## PEP-TALK

### OSU Extension Pesticide Education Program

Vol 3 Issue 3 March 1998

#### In This Issue:

- [Ohio Section 18](#)
- [Key Pesticides Threatened by FQPA--Editorial](#)
- [Congress Warns EPA On Planned FQPA Action Itinerary](#)
- [Food Quality Protection Act Brochure Information](#)
- [Pesticide Resources in County Mailing](#)
- [Worker Protection Standard And Enclosed Cab Specifications](#)
- [San Francisco First Major Urban School District to Ban Most Pesticides](#)
- ["Super Agency" For Food Safety Proposed](#)
- [The Ground Never Lies](#)
- [Notice of Availability of Regional Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program Grants](#)
- [Chemical and Label Update](#)

#### OHIO SECTION 18

On March 12, 1998 the EPA granted a Section 18 exemption for the use of metolachlor on transplanted tomatoes to control eastern black nightshade in Ohio. This exemption specifies that Dual and Dual 8E may be applied as a preplant or preemergence application. This specific exemption expires on July 10, 1998. For information on the specific conditions and restrictions of this exemption, contact ODA or the PAT office. (Tom Camm, ODA fax, March 13, 1998)

#### KEY PESTICIDES THREATENED BY FQPA -- EDITORIAL

In August 1996, the President signed the Food Quality Protection Act into law. The FQPA is the most significant piece of pesticide and food safety legislation passed in many years. While agriculture prematurely celebrated

the demise of the Delaney Clause, the new policies and procedures set in place by the law now threaten key groups of agricultural pesticides, notably the organophosphates (OP's) and the carbamates.

In recent months, EPA has made it clear that the potential exists to cancel many organophosphate uses in the near future. OP's include insecticides such as malathion, diazinon, Orthene, Lorsban, Guthion, Disyston, and Imidan. Sevin and Furdan are examples of the carbamate insecticides.

These two groups represent a significant portion of pesticides available for agricultural use. As a result, minor crop producers face the loss of significant tools for their IPM programs and serious challenges in altering their production practices since, in many cases, replacements for these products do not exist. In the future, another group of pesticides that include the EBDC fungicides, such as Bravo and Dithane, face review as well.

FQPA requires EPA to evaluate groups of pesticides together with common modes of action as well as all sources of exposure, not just dietary. As a result the "risk" cup for exposure is already overflowing for the OP's. EPA must decide on cancellations. In recent meetings EPA has been vague in outlining their actual decision-making schedule. But, the clock is ticking on Congress's mandate to review and to take action by August 1999 on 33% of all pesticides of which the OP's are the first targeted group.

As grower groups and the chemical industry have come to realize that the OP's and other products are in serious danger of being lost, they have begun to challenge EPA's decision-making process and underlying assumptions. In the meantime, environmental groups have stepped up their efforts to push for discontinuing the OP's and other classes of pesticides.

In the meantime, some food processors are already requiring contract growers to restrict or eliminate some products from their spray programs this season. Pesticide manufacturer's may ultimately make the decision regarding what remains in the market based on economics. They may sacrifice minor uses to keep more profitable uses.

What EPA will do and when is anyone's guess. Certainly, growers need to make their voices heard NOW on what uses are absolutely essential to them. Another need is accurate use data. Various agricultural organizations are surveying and working to find out actual use information so that EPA will not use default, worst-case assumptions in their decisions. Growers can help by taking the time to provide good, accurate information on how various pesticides are actually used in their production and how much is used.

Whether enough pressure can be placed on Congress to revisit the law they blindly passed two years ago remains to be seen. One thing is certain, if the EPA continues on the path they are suggesting, FQPA will change the face of agricultural food production.

Joanne Kick-Raack, Coordinator, Pesticide Applicator Training  
(For more information, check out the FQPA website at  
<http://www.epa.gov/opppsps1/fqpa/>)

### **CONGRESS WARNS EPA ON PLANNED FQPA ACTION ITINERARY**

On January 16, 1998, the House Agricultural Committee sent a warning letter to EPA. The committee advised the Agency that their current approach to carrying out the FQPA using default assumptions could result in numerous unnecessary losses of organophosphate and carbamate insecticidal products or product uses critical to producers, residential and non-residential users.

The committee further told EPA that using these default assumptions "is unnecessary and that the law clearly provides the Agency with broad authority to delay the effective date of an order or regulation to provide registrants and others the opportunity to develop data to support the continuation of the tolerance." Review schedules set out in the Act "need not drive the Agency to make hasty decisions which could result in negative consequences for U.S. agricultural producers and non-agricultural users." (Chemically Speaking, February 1998)

On March 10, the House Commerce Committee also sent a letter. The Congressmen stated "this law in no way was intended as the beginning of an agency race to remove products from the market, but as the continuation and enhancement of responsible, reasoned, scientific decision-making, which balances public health goals with real needs of American agriculture," they concluded. (P & T News, March 12, 1998)

### **FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT BROCHURE INFORMATION**

**"Consumers and Pesticides: The Brochure That's Annoying Everyone."**  
(Washington Post, 11 March 1998)

A recent article in the Washington Post took a detailed look at the controversy over a draft version of EPA's brochure "Pesticides on Food: Consumer Information." The brochure has been called "negative and alarming" by the grocery industry, and environmental and consumer groups have called it milquetoast and written through "rosy-colored glasses." A final version of the brochure must be available in stores by August and will answer these questions about pesticides: "why they're used on food, how harmful they may be, what the government is doing to protect consumers from harmful amounts of them, and ways to remove some of the residues on food." The brochure can be viewed on EPA's Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-PEST/1998/January/Day-14/s-p925.htm>.

The PAT office has downloaded this brochure and we can send you a copy if

you do not have access to the web. (Forwarded by Mike Weaver, Virginia Tech, March 13, 1998)

### **PESTICIDE RESOURCES IN COUNTY MAILING**

In next week's county mail you should receive copies of two items that were not received in time for distribution at the Agent Pesticide In-Service in January.

1. EPA brochure on selecting PPE. This brochure contains the chemical resistance chart Art Schwoppe referred to in his talk on protective equipment. (This chart was also printed on page 57 in our Ohio PAT Conference Proceedings for winter 1995-1996 and distributed in 1995.)
2. New Purdue Bulletin for homeowner pesticide use.

### **WORKER PROTECTION STANDARD AND ENCLOSED CAB SPECIFICATIONS**

The American Society of Agricultural Engineers has published a Standard, S-525, concerning performance standards for enclosed tractor cabs. The standard recognizes two types of cabs. One type is termed an "ECPAD"; this means "enclosed cab, pesticide application, dermal protection". The ECPAD type of cab will offer ONLY dermal protection. In order to comply with WPS, operators of a ECPAD would need to wear the label-specified respirator; the personal protective equipment requirements of the handler/operator would be long sleeved shirt, long pants, shoes, and socks. Also note that WPS requires that the operator of the enclosed cab carry label specified personal protective equipment in the event that an exit is necessary within a treated area.

The second type of cab is termed an "ECPAR" in the S-525. "ECPAR" is the abbreviation used in the S-525 for "enclosed cab, pesticide application, respiratory protection." An ECPAR cab will provide respiratory protection equivalent to an organic vapor-removing cartridge respirator. This will satisfy the label specification of TC-21C and TC-23C respirators; the handler would wear long sleeved shirt, long pants, shoes, and socks.

The Agency is working with the agricultural cab industry and ASAE to provide additional information and guidance about enclosed cabs and the Standard.

You may contact the ASAE to purchase a copy of the Enclosed Cab Standard publication S-525 at: 2950 Niles Rd., St. Joseph, MI 49085-9659 voice: 616-429-0300 fax: 616-429-3852 email: [hq@asae.org](mailto:hq@asae.org)  
(Judy Smith, USEPA, Worker Protection, March 12, 1998)

## **SAN FRANCISCO FIRST MAJOR URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT TO BAN MOST PESTICIDES**

"Piggy-backing on the city's year-old policy for public parks and buildings, San Francisco's Board of Education voted unanimously Feb. 10 to strictly limit pesticide use in public schools." (P & T News, February 26, 1998) The policy immediately banned the use of specific pesticides. Those include: EPA acute toxicity category I and II pesticides, EPA carcinogenicity categories A, B, and C, and pesticides "known to the state of California" to cause cancer.

"Beginning January 1, 1999, the school district may only use pesticides identified by the San Francisco Department of the Environment as 'reduced risk pesticides.'"(P & T News, February 26, 1998)

## **"SUPER AGENCY" FOR FOOD SAFETY PROPOSED**

Senators Richard Durbin (D-Ill) and Robert Toricelli (D-NJ) recently introduced a bill to create a new federal agency to oversee all food safety regulation. The proposed agency, the Federal Food Safety Administration, would take the food safety roles of the EPA, USDA, and FDA and combine them into a single administrative unit. Currently, 12 different federal agencies and numerous separate laws govern food safety in the U.S. (Pesticide Notes, January-February 1998)

## **THE GROUND NEVER LIES**

Many states require pest control businesses that store large volumes of pesticides and fertilizers to do so in containment. Pest control businesses have for the most part complied by diking, that is, by placing their bulk storage tanks on concrete floors surrounded by concrete walls. Attached to the diked area is a concrete pad used to off-load incoming products or to mix products in application equipment.

Product containment was thought by industry and regulators to be an important management tool in preventing pesticides and fertilizers from contaminating nearby soil and water. But how effective have the regulations been in preventing contamination? Until recently, the question had not been addressed. The Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA), in the summer of 1996, randomly selected 30 agricultural crop production retail facilities and tested their soil for pesticide contamination. The soil sampling plan looked for many pesticides - in particular, those registered after the 1989 bulk storage regulations went into effect. MDA took 93 surface soil samples (0-6 in. deep) from five predefined areas: the small package product mix and load area; the bulk pesticide mix and load area; the fertilizer impregnation area; the water filling station; and obvious runoff areas containing stressed vegetation.

Pesticides were detected in 84 soil samples from 26 facilities. Pesticides registered since 1989 were detected in the majority. Examples: Acetochlor, which was found in 59 percent of the soil samples at an average value of 2 parts per million; and Nicosulfuron, which was detected in 34 percent of the samples at an average of 0.005 ppm.

The origins of most pesticide escapes were bulk pesticide storage areas, followed by fertilizer impregnation areas, small package mix and load areas, water fill areas, and runoff areas.

MDA inspectors solicited comments from several facility managers on how pesticides registered after the containment systems had been built could find their way to the soil surface. A number of reasons were offered: tires tracking pesticides from the load pads onto soil; spilled materials swept off of pads onto soil; washing of equipment; wind blowing impregnated fertilizer off the load pads; and overfilling of equipment by unsupervised customers.

The MDA reports that this survey does show that the regulations have been effective in preventing large amounts of pesticides from contaminating the soil surface. However, they cautioned that, in as little as three years, some of the facilities were beginning to see serious contamination levels. This report stressed to businesses that store and use pesticides to continually review how the products are handled on-site because "the ground never lies."

(Source: Results of 1996 Soil Sampling of Pesticides on Crop Production Retailer Facilities. 1997. Minnesota Department of Agriculture. Via The Label, January 1998)

## **NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF REGIONAL PESTICIDE ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM GRANTS**

EPA has announced the availability of approximately \$498 thousand in fiscal year 1998 grant/cooperative agreement funds for grants to States and all Federally recognized Native American Tribes. The grant dollars are targeted at State and Tribal programs that address reduction of the risks associated with pesticide use in agricultural and non-agricultural settings in the United States. EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs is offering grant opportunities to interested parties.

In order to be considered for funding during the FY'98 award cycle, all applications must be received by the appropriate EPA regional office on or before May 20, 1998.

For more information contact: Region V EPA: David Macarus, (DRT-8J), 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, Telephone (312) 353-5814, [macarus.david@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:macarus.david@epamail.epa.gov) (Federal Register, March 6, 1998)

## **CHEMICAL & LABEL UPDATE**

The following information provides registration status of particular pesticides and should not be considered as pesticide recommendations by OSU Extension.

### **FIELD CROPS**

**Lambda-cyhalothrin** -- Zeneca Ag Products-- EPA established tolerances for residues of the pyrethroid lambda-cyhalothrin and its epimer in or on alfalfa forage and alfalfa hay. (Federal Register, February 13, 1998)

**Norflurazon** -- Time-limited tolerances for residues of this herbicide were extended in or on bermudagrass forage and hay for an additional 1-year period, to November 30, 1999. (Federal Register, February 25, 1998 )

### **FRUIT & VEGETABLE**

**Dimethomorph**-- EPA has established time-limited tolerances in or on squash, cantaloupe, watermelon, and cucumber. (Federal Register, February 18, 1998)

**Lambda-cyhalothrin** -- Zeneca Ag Products-- EPA established tolerances for residues of the pyrethroid lambda-cyhalothrin in or on leaf lettuce, brassica head and stem subgroup (broccoli, Chinese broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, Chinese (napa) cabbage, Chinese mustard, cauliflower, caval broccolo, and kohlrabi). (Federal Register, February 13, 1998)

**Myclobutanil** -- This rule extends a time-limited tolerance for residues of the fungicide myclobutanil in or on strawberries for an additional 1-year period, to March 31, 1999. (Federal Register, March 4, 1998)

**Thiabendazole** -- EPA established a time-limited tolerance for residues of thiabendazole in or on lentils. (Federal Register, February 25, 1998)

**Vinclozolin** -- EPA is revoking the tolerances for residues of this pesticide in or on the raw agricultural commodities tomatoes, plums, prunes, grapes (other than wine grapes), and the food additive tolerances for prunes and raisins. EPA is revoking these tolerances because the uses associated with them have been voluntarily deleted from vinclozolin labels. (Federal Register, February 13, 1998)

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Pendimethalin** -- This rule extends time-limited tolerances for residues of this herbicide in or on fresh mint hay and mint oil for an additional 1-year period, to May 31, 1999. (Federal Register, March 4, 1998)

### **Notice of Receipt of Requests to Voluntarily Cancel Certain Pesticide Registrations**

EPA is issuing a notice of receipt of requests by registrants to voluntarily cancel the following pesticide registrations. Unless a request is withdrawn by August 10, 1998, orders will be issued canceling all of these registrations.

Boundary DF Herbicide

Evik 80W

Prowl 3E Herbicide

Weedone LV6 and LV 4 Emulsifiable Broadleaf Herbicide

Sevin Brand XLR Carbaryl Insecticide

Casoron 4G

SMCP Diazinon Insect Spray, 4S, RP 12.5, RP 25E, and 6-S

Insecticide Liquid, Diazinon, 1%

Diazinon 4AG

Pratt Diazinon 18E and Ag4E Insect Spray

Multicide Intermediate 2232

Dimethogon 267 EC

Supreme Oil

Monitor 4

Chemscope Total Release Fogger

Fremont 9117 Microbiocide

Verta Green Sprayable Herbicide

Clean Crop Trifluralin EC & 4EC

Clean Crop Benomyl 50% DF Systemic Fungicide

Clean Crop Curbit EC Herbicide

(Federal Register, February 11, 1998)

Camille Roush-Kopczewski

Editor, Extension Associate

Pesticide Applicator Training

[E-mail: roush-kopczewski.16@osu.edu](mailto:roush-kopczewski.16@osu.edu)

Joanne Kick-Raack

Coordinator

Pesticide Applicator Training

[E-mail: kick-raack.1@osu.edu](mailto:kick-raack.1@osu.edu)

Pesticide Applicator Training Office  
Rm. 249 Howlett Hall  
2001 Fyffe Ct.  
Columbus, OH 43210-1096  
Phone: (614)292-4070  
Fax:(614)292-3505