(continued from page 55)

sod farms, golf courses, and cemeteries; do not use near human dwellings.

MOCAP 10G. 5 to 7 lbs./1,000 square feet or 200 to 300 lbs./acre. May be applied to commercial turf such as golf courses, sod farms and cemeteries; may be used on home lawns only by certified commercial applicators. May be applied to bermuda, zoysia, St. Augustine, centipede, and bahia grasses. Effective against sting, awl, spiral, and some other ectoparasitic nematodes, but erratic in control of lance, root-knot, and and other endoparasitic species.

MOCAP EC. 2/3 to 1 pint/1,000 square feet or 3.5 to 5 gallons/acre. Do not use on home lawns. May be applied to commercial turf such as golf course, sod farms, and cemeteries. This formulation has the same limitations of effectiveness as the 10G. Foliar application with IMMEDIATE irrigation to wash Mocap EC from the foliage may result in serious injury to foliage.

SAROLEX EC. 1.5 to 2.5 pints/1,000 square feet or 8.2 to 13.6 gallons/acre. May be used on turf and lawns, including home lawns; has limited effectiveness gainst sting and few other ectoparasitic nematodes, with little or none against lance, root-knot, and other endoparasitic species.

(Dr. Bob Dunn, Extension Nematologist, Entomology and Nematology News, Volume 10, Number 3: May, June 1984.)

Pesticide Exposure Shown Despite Protective Clothing

Recent University of California research has shown that pesticide applicators may be getting unsuspeted levels of skin exposure to pesticides. Six workers, operating tractor-powered rigs to spray a diazinon/oil mixture in a pear orchard were studied. Each worker wore long trousers, a shirt, overalls, boots, a hat, rubber gloves, and either a respirator or a plastic mask. Despite these precautions, the detection systems showed that pesticide had penetrated the protective clothing and droplets had reached the skin through openings around the wrists and necks of the workers.

To measure the exposure, a fluorescent whitening agent was mixed with the pesticide. After the spraying was over the workers took off their clothing, the researchers then shone long-wave ultraviolet light (black light) on them.

The fluorescence glowed wherever the pesticide had reached the skin, and the researchers photographed the workers with a television camera equipped to operate in extremely low light. Then a computer translated the TV image into digital information, computing the relative exposure levels of each skin area according to the brighteness of its fluorescence. The detection system cannot yet measure the exact quantity of pesticide that reaches each spot of skin.

The scientists, Richard A. Fenski, John T. Leffingwell, and Robert C. Spear, are with the Department of Biomedical and Environmental Health Science (sic) at U.C. Berkeley. They described their experiments at an American Chemical Society meeting recently in St. Louis, Mo. Their findings raise questions concerning protective clothing to be worn by pesticide applicators and call into question previous methods of predicting and detecting contamination. (This story is based on a story from the San Francisco Chronical by David Perlman Science Editor) *The IPM Practioner* vol. V1, No. 5. ■

CHEMICALLY SPEAKING
September 1984