

PEP-Talk, December, 2005

Pesticide Education Program
Ohio State University Extension
Joanne Kick-Raack, State Coordinator
Cindy Folck, Communications
Vol. 9, Issue 11

In This Issue

- **WPS How-to-Comply Manual**
- **WPS Fines of \$39,750 Issued in Idaho**
- **Farmer and Farm Service Lose Lawsuit**
- **Value of Fungicides Calculated**
- **Anti-Pesticide By-Law Defeated**
- **Organic Seal Allowed on Non-Food Products**
- **Upcoming Events**

WPS How-to-Comply Manual

This week, EPA released the revised Worker Protection Standard for Agricultural Pesticides How-to-Comply Manual. This manual replaces the original that was released in 1993.

A cd-rom that contains the new How-to-Comply manual and other WPS materials will be given to each county office at the PAT Educator Inservice on Dec. 8 and 9. The manual is also available at <http://www.epa.gov/agriculture/htc.html>

WPS Fines of \$39,750 Issued in Idaho

Fines of almost \$40,000 for violations of the Worker Protection Standard and failing to follow instructions on the labels of the pesticides used were handed out to a farm, an aerial spraying service and the employer of the farm workers involved in the incident.

The incident involved fields that were sprayed between midnight and 1:30 a.m. on July 6. The onion and sugar beet fields were sprayed with methomyl, zeta-cypermethrin and mancozeb. A state

law requires pilots to notify farmers 24 hours in advance of the pesticide application, but the farm stated that the pilot didn't inform them about the spraying until the afternoon of July 6. Farm workers had entered the fields at 6:00 a.m. and by noon were vomiting and suffering from headaches, nausea and diarrhea.

Portable toilets, which also were used as WPS decontamination sites, had been moved away from the fields before the July 6 incident. Local fire fighters responded to the emergency and put up a contamination tent for clothing removal and washing. The workers were treated at local hospitals.

The farm was fined for failure to train employees properly and failure to provide and maintain proper safety information at a central location on the farm. The central posting must contain emergency information and any pesticide application made to the farm within 30 days. (*Source: U.S. EPA Office of Pesticide Programs, Nov. 29, 2005*)

Farmer and Farm Service Lose Lawsuit

A California vegetable producer lost a lawsuit that was filed by the community of Arvin, Calif., which is primarily populated by immigrant farm workers. The suit, which was also included the farm service that made the pesticide application, was filed because members of the community said they became sick after nearby fields of carrots and potatoes were sprayed with metam-sodium and the pesticide drifted to nearby homes.

The pesticide applicator was fined \$60,000 by the State of California for the incident. However, community members filed the suit and were awarded \$775,000; of which \$275,00 will be paid by the farm and \$500,000 by the farm service. (*Source: U.S. EPA Office of Pesticide Programs via Beyond Pesticides, Nov. 28, 2005*)

Value of Fungicides Calculated

A September study released by CropLife Foundation says every dollar U.S. growers spend on fungicides results in a \$14.60 return in increased crop production value. The researchers looked at 50

specific crops in 49 states (Alaska was not part of the research). The crops were mainly berry, field, fruit, nut, specialty and vegetable crops. The researchers concluded that for the 231 diseases found in these crops, no fungicide use would result in a 50 to 95 percent decline in fruit and vegetable crop yields. The research information can be found at http://www.croplifefoundation.org/cpri_benefits_fungicides.htm (Source: *Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News*, Vol. 33, No. 48)

Anti-Pesticide By-Law Defeated

The city council of Canada's capital city, Ottawa, voted down a by-law that would have placed restrictions on the use of pesticides for lawn care in the city. Similar laws have passed in Canadian cities like Toronto and Halifax. Proponents of the restrictions are promising to bring the issue up during city elections. (Source: *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*, Nov. 10, 2005)

Organic Seal Allowed on Non-Food Products

The USDA organic seal can be displayed on personal care products as long as they are certified to meet the National Organic Program standards for organic agricultural products according to a recent announcement by the Department. USDA was facing a lawsuit by the Organic Consumers Association and a manufacturer of organic soaps, lotions and balms regarding use of the seal. (Source: *Pesticide and Toxic Chemical News*, Vol. 33, No. 46)

Upcoming Events

PAT Agent Inservice

December 8 and 9, 2005
Agriculture Administration Auditorium
OSU Campus, Columbus

Ohio Commercial Recertification Schools

General Schools (turf, ornamental, industrial vegetation and pest control)
Perrysburg – December 14, 2005

Dayton – February 2, 2006
Columbus – February 23, 2006

Field Crop Conferences (agronomic pest control)

Lima – December 15, 2005
Columbus – February 8, 2006

Wood-Destroying Insect Inspection

March 9, 2006
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Taught at ODA in Reynoldsburg

Commercial New Applicator School

March 16, 2006
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Taught at ODA in Reynoldsburg

OSU Extension embraces human diversity and is committed to ensuring that all educational programs conducted by Ohio State University Extension are available to clientele on a nondiscriminatory basis without regard to race, color, age, gender identity or expression, disability, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, or veteran status. Keith L. Smith, Associate Vice President for Agricultural Administration and Director, OSU Extension TDD No. 800-589-8292 (Ohio only) or 614-292-1868