State, federal pesticide officials discuss new regs

The American Association of Pesticide Officials held its annual spring meeting March 11-13 in Crystal City, Va. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency officials spoke on important upcoming pesticide regulations concerning containers, pesticide mixing and loading containment and worker protection, and also discussed the re-registration process. Implementation of the regulations will take effect over the next three years.

CONTAINER REGULATIONS

An updated implementation schedule of EPA’s FIFRA pesticide container regulations was released at the AAPCO meeting. The soon-to-be-written regulations will address pesticide management (including mixing and loading containment and disposal).

Phase 1 regulations, which mostly pertain to manufacturers and distributors of pesticide products, deal with acceptance; voluntary and mandatory recall plans; storage and disposal plans; and indemnification. Phase 1 regulations will be implemented in spring 1992.

Phase 2 regulations concern containers, residue removal and bulk storage and are scheduled for implementation in spring 1993.

Phase 3 involves pesticide management regulations that are concerned with storage, management of excess product, containment at mixing/loading sites, and transportation. Spring 1994 is the targeted implementation date for Phase 3.

WORKER PROTECTION AND TRAINING

State pesticide control officials attending the conference suggested that the training requirements for the new worker protection regulations be compatible with those for restricted-use pesticide applications.

The worker protection rules will be released this summer, but the restricted-use application requirements are not scheduled for release until sometime next year, as part of the final applicator certification regulations.

The final version of the worker protection regulations, which are scheduled for release in late August, will contain specific rules concerning post-application re-entry and training for pesticide applicators. These worker protection regulations will affect only those golf courses that are involved in producing turf and plants for commercial uses outside of their normal golf course operations.

The revised applicator certification regulations that are scheduled for release in 1992 will, however, affect all courses that apply restricted-use pesticides.

GCSAA will urge the agency to consider coordinating these two separate training requirements when writing the final regulations.

GCSAA recently sent comments on the proposed levels of supervision for restricted-use pesticide application to EPA. The Office of Government Relations had surveyed affiliated-chapter government relations liaisons for their comments on the proposed rules. The majority of respondents said they believed that only certified applicators should be able to apply restricted-use pesticides. GCSAA comments, along with comments from other interested parties, will be considered when the final regulations are drafted.

REREГISTRATION

The reregistration process is still lagging behind previous projections, said Allan Abramson, acting director of the special review and reregistration division of EPA’s Office of Pesticide Programs.

Because of delays in processing the registration of A and B list pesticides (mostly those used on food products), the C and D list pesticides—which include most of the turf and ornamental products—will not be up for reregistration until 1992 or 1993.

Some manufacturers may decide to save the testing costs and reregistration fees for some minor-use products (i.e., products that are not primary revenue producers) by choosing not to reregister them. The EPA’s processing delays may also delay the need for golf course superintendents to search for alternatives for suspended products.

However, the federal EPA is not the only pesticide regulator; the states also are involved.

STATE REGISTRATION

Some states are raising their pesticide registration fees—in some cases by 300 percent to 500 percent. These big fee hikes are causing pesticide manufacturers, especially smaller companies, to reconsider which products they choose to register in which states. The end result may be that superintendents in some states may soon find their choice of chemicals restricted.

This meeting brought together the federal and state regulators and the manufacturers of pesticide products. One of the last points to be made came from several state pesticide regulators: The new federal regulations will put much heavier burdens on the states; however, the states may not have the resources they need to manage or enforce them.
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Senate considers notification rule

The lawn-care industry and environmentalists squared off May 9 at a Senate hearing.

The Environment Committee’s subcommittee on toxic substances is holding hearings on legislation sponsored by Democratic Sens. Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut and Harry Reid of Nevada. Their bill would require lawn-care companies to notify neighbors within 1,000 feet of a property before applying pesticides or herbicides.

enue producers) by choosing not to re
Witnesses testifying for the environmentalists included a woman who said she was severely injured when she was drenched by chemicals being sprayed on a neighbor’s lawn. Christina Loeck of Chicago said she was nearly blinded and has had to use canes to walk since the incident, which also killed her dog and her cat.

Warren Stickle, president of the Chemical Producers and Distributors Association, said the bill’s notification system was so extensive that it would be unworkable and extremely burdensome to businesses and local governments.

Ann McClure, executive vice president of the Professional Lawn Care Association of America, said her group supports a more limited notification requirement, covering people who live adjacent to a customer’s property.

Reid said more than 7 million Americans used $1.7 billion worth of lawn-care products and services in 1987. Americans use up to 10 times more chemical pesticides per acre for lawns than for agriculture, he said, citing a report by the National Academy of Sciences.

*Excerpted from Orlando Sentinel*

**EPA investigates manipulation of pesticide data**

A Texas laboratory is the subject of an EPA/Justice Department criminal investigation for allegedly falsifying studies on pesticide residues. The EPA said that studies on 17 pesticides — including several golf course chemicals — produced by 11 manufacturers were “alleged to have been improperly manipulated” by Craven Laboratories, Austin, Tex.

The golf course chemicals listed by the EPA were maneb, sethoxydim, Diquat, mancozeb, fenoxaprop-ethyl, glyphosate and PCNB.

Craven has produced residue chemistry studies for pesticides since 1975, and the EPA is reviewing regulatory options for registrations based on Craven data. Options include requiring replacement data and “other alternatives,” according to the EPA. The agency has sent letters to 262 pesticide registrants asking them to identify all Craven data filed with EPA to support registrations and tolerances, and to estimate when they could file studies to replace Craven data.

The Craven investigation will take time. And if the EPA decides to require replacement data, it will take substantial time and money for the chemical manufacturers to have new studies conducted. If this happens, it could affect the availability and price of some pesticide products that golf course superintendents use.

Linda Fisher, an assistant EPA administrator, said that although current information does not indicate a threat to the environment or to public health, the allegations are “very serious.”

The EPA will review registration data on a chemical-by-chemical and use-by-use basis as it explores regulatory options. One EPA spokesman told The Wall Street Journal that the agency does not currently expect new data to require the removal of any of the products from the market.

**EPA chief testifies on Clean Water Reauthorization**

EPA Administrator William K. Reilly testified at a House oversight committee hearing that one of the most important issues in the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act is non-point source pollution control.

Reilly told the House Public Works and Transportation Committee that controlling non-point sources of pollution (examples could include runoff of chemicals applied to agricultural field, golf courses and home lawns) would often be more cost-effective than adding additional technological controls at point sources.

Many industries already use technological controls to remove harmful pollutants from water before discharging it into surface waters. Some golf courses presently use the simple technology of a rinse pad and containment system to prevent point-source pollution during mixing and loading.

If such a system is not available, courses should never mix and load near a water source, such as a well or pond, and should rotate sites.
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**Fish and Wildlife Svc. joins EPA in pesticide exams**

EPA is consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine whether some registered uses of 31 pesticides need to be limited in order to protect endangered species.

Among the pesticides to be examined are some golf course chemicals: acephate (Orthene), bendiocarb (Turcam), chlorpyrifos (Dursban and others), potassium nitrate, trifluralin (Treflan, Team and others), methyl bromide, aluminum phosphide (Phostoxin), azinphos methyl (Guthion), fenvalerate, naled and permethrin.
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