



# Outstanding Pesticide Dealer and Applicator Honored

A North Dakota pesticide dealer and custom application cooperative were recognized for outstanding customer service and environmental awareness Tuesday, Dec. 1, 2009, during the Northern Ag Expo at the Fargodome in Fargo.

The North Dakota Department of Agriculture (NDDA) and North Dakota Agricultural Association

(NDAA) presented the 2009 North Dakota Outstanding Pesticide Dealer of the Year award to Wholesale Ag Products, Carrington, and the 2009 Outstanding Applicator of the Year award to North Star Co-op, Park River.

“Wholesale Ag Products and North Star Co-op provide their customers with knowledgeable and reliable service while demonstrating responsibility for human health and safety and environmental awareness in the sale and application of pesticides,” said Jim Gray, NDDA pesticide division director, who presented the awards on behalf of Agriculture Commissioner Doug Goehring. “Their commitment to excellence helps ensure that North Dakotans continue to enjoy clean water and air.”

Richard Zink, owner-founder, and Bruce Bachmeier, general manager of Wholesale Ag Products, and Tom Lien of North Star Co-op accepted the awards.

Now in its 25th year, Wholesale Ag Products provides a full range of agricultural chemicals, fertilizer and seed. The company has five full-time and five part-time employees. North Star Co-op resulted from the 2003 merger of two long-established Farmers Union oil companies. The cooperative offers ground

application of farm chemicals and fertilizers, and also sells liquid fertilizer and anhydrous ammonia. It has six full-time and up to six part-time employees.

“These awards recognize good stewardship of soil, water and air through the safe and proper use of plant nutrient and crop protection products,” said Gary Knutson, NDAA executive director.

“The North Dakota Agricultural Association is proud to recognize people who excel in customer service and environmental awareness.”

North Dakota has nearly 8,000 certified commercial/public applicators and dealers.

The winners were nominated by North Dakota Department of Agriculture pesticide inspectors.

## In this issue . . .

Outstanding Pesticide Dealer and Applicator Honored .....	1
EPA Proposes New Pesticide Labeling to Control Spray Drift and Protect Human Health .....	2
Coordinator’s Comments .....	2
Farm Bureau Petitions U.S. Supreme Court on Pesticide Case .....	3
2010 Commercial Pesticide Certification Calendar .....	4
EPA’s Interpretation of Farmer Liability Under FIFRA .....	5
Audubon of Kansas Claims Pesticides Deadly to Prairie Dogs and Threaten Imperiled Animals .....	6
Field Pesticide Application Techniques .....	6
Understanding How Malaria was Eradicated from the U.S. ....	7
Training Opportunities for New Applicators/Dealers .....	8

North Dakota State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity, disability, age, status as a U.S. veteran, sexual orientation, marital status, or public assistance status. Direct inquiries to the Vice President for Equity, Diversity and Global Outreach, 205 Old Main, (701) 231-7708.

County Commissions, NDSU and U.S. Department of Agriculture Cooperating. This publication will be made available in alternative formats for people with disabilities upon request, (701) 231-7881.

## Need help with pesticide certification or general pesticide use issues?

**Contact:**

NDSU Pesticide Training and Certification Program  
 NDSU Dept. 7060  
 205 Walster Hall, P.O. Box 6050  
 Fargo, ND 58108-6050 USA  
 Phone: (701) 231-7180  
 Fax: (701) 231-5907  
 E-mail: [NDSU.pesticide@ndsu.edu](mailto:NDSU.pesticide@ndsu.edu)  
 Web: [www.ndsupesticide.org](http://www.ndsupesticide.org)

# EPA Proposes New Pesticide Labeling to Control Spray Drift and Protect Human Health

*Editor's Note: For years, the Environmental Protection Agency has struggled to craft meaningful drift labeling language that would satisfy environmental advocacy groups, industry and state regulatory authorities. Below, the EPA announces several courses of action that it is contemplating. These are draft proposals, so we likely will not see concrete actions until after the 2010 spray season.*

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has rolled out proposed

guidance for new pesticide labeling to reduce off-target spray and dust drift. The new instructions, when implemented, will improve the clarity and consistency of pesticide labels and help prevent harm from spray drift.

"The new label statements will help reduce problems from pesticide drift," said Steve Owens, the assistant administrator for the EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. "The new labels

will carry more uniform and specific directions on restricting spray drift while giving pesticide applicators clear and workable instructions."

The new instructions will prohibit drift that could cause adverse health or environmental effects. Also, on a pesticide-by-pesticide basis, the EPA will evaluate scientific information on risk and exposure based on individual product use patterns. These assessments will help the agency determine whether no-spray buffer zones or other measures, such as restrictions on droplet or particle size, nozzle height or weather conditions, are needed to protect people, wildlife, water resources, schools and other sensitive sites from potential harm.

In addition to the draft notice on pesticide drift labeling, the EPA also is seeking comment on a draft pesticide drift labeling interpretation document that provides guidance to state and tribal enforcement officials. A second document provides background information on pesticide drift, a description of current and planned EPA actions, a readers guide explaining key terms and concepts, and specific questions on which the EPA is seeking input. Official comments will be accepted through March 5, 2010. These documents and further information are available in docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0628 at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).

Additional background information is available at the EPA's Spray Drift Web page at [www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/spraydrift.htm](http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/spraydrift.htm).

The EPA's official contact on this matter is Dale Kemery, e-mail: [kemery.dale@epa.gov](mailto:kemery.dale@epa.gov) and telephone: (202) 564-7839 or (202) 564-4355.

---

## Coordinator's Comments

Some days, you just do not know where to start.

So I'll begin by personally congratulating our outstanding pesticide dealer and applicator of the year: Wholesale Ag Products of Carrington and Northstar Co-op of Park River. Folks like you get me up and out the door to do pesticide trainings. Thank you for your fine efforts, and especially thanks for the inspiration.


I received a number of compliments regarding my article in the last PQ titled "Why Did They Spray DDT Like That?" Most of you are too kind (or perhaps you are starved for exciting reading material). Regardless, I thought you might be interested in a follow-up. So in this issue, you will find an article about how the U.S. eradicated malaria. Enjoy.

I'm starting my 14th training season with NDSU and I continue to be amazed how complicated the use of pesticides has become. At our Fargodome training, we kicked off our agriculture category trainings with a new exercise called "Label

Gotcha." The purpose of the exercise is to explore the difficulties and complexities of reading and following the pesticide label. What's different about this from previous years is I purposely highlighted difficult phrases or directions from a half-dozen different products commonly used in our region. Most of the questions had three potential answers: yes, no and not sure. The results were all over the board. Having 200 applicators split evenly among the three choices was not unusual. Given that, how does a conscientious and well-intentioned applicator read and follow the label? Needless to say, it's complicated!

The good news is that the folks at the trainings have responded with enthusiasm, and we have had some very spirited interactions. I won't go so far as to say we've been having fun, but I will say that more learning has been going on than in the past.

Stay safe this winter,



Andrew A. Thostenson  
Pesticide Program Specialist

# Farm Bureau Petitions U.S. Supreme Court on Pesticide Case

*Editor's Note: In November 2009, the American Farm Bureau Federation announced it was filing a petition with the Supreme Court about recent lower court rulings on the need for National Pollution Discharge Elimination permitting for certain pesticide applications. In December, the petition, along with several supporting briefs, was filed with the court. At the time of this writing, the court has not acted on the petition. However, in a brief submitted in early January by President Barack Obama's solicitor general, the Supreme Court was urged not to overturn the lower court ruling.*

The American Farm Bureau Federation has filed a petition with the U.S. Supreme Court asking the high court to review a lower court ruling that would impose Clean Water Act permitting requirements on the application of pesticides on, over or near water.

"Allowing the lower court ruling to stand would pose serious challenges to farmers battling pests," said AFBF President Bob Stallman. "When pests strike, time is of the essence, and any length of time waiting for permit approval for products that are already approved would be disastrous."

The problem stems from a January 2009 ruling by the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, which struck down a 2006 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) rule that interpreted the Clean Water Act as not regulating most pesticide applications into, over or near "waters of the United States," so long as the pesticide use complied with EPA's requirements (such as EPA-approved label restrictions).

The 6th Circuit found in *National Cotton Council v. EPA* that the EPA must require Clean Water Act permits for pesticide application in water or near waters where pesticide falls into the water. The court recognized only a very narrow exception for chemical pesticides intentionally applied to water that leave no "residue" after their use is complete. The AFBF's petition seeks Supreme Court review of that decision.

The practical effect of the 6th Circuit decision is that almost all pesticide applications directly to water, over water or "near" water will require a Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. If the decision is allowed to stand, farmers and others who use pesticides, such as mosquito abatement districts, will be required to obtain permits to apply pesticides on or near water.

Since the EPA views "waters of the United States" very broadly, including wetlands and even some ditches, the decision could affect hundreds of thousands of farmers. In its petition to the U.S. Supreme Court, the AFBF argues that the EPA pesticide rule simply formalized how the EPA and Congress always have addressed environmental regulation of pesticide use.

"Since Congress enacted the Clean Water Act in 1972, EPA has never subjected the use of pesticides to NPDES permitting," explained Julie Anna Potts, the AFBF's general counsel. "This court opinion dramatically changes the scope of the Clean Water Act and will force farmers, public health agencies and many others into burdensome,

time-consuming and costly permitting requirements that could seriously impair their ability to use pesticides to protect croplands and public health.

"AFBF submitted its petition to the U.S. Supreme Court to seek correction of a decision that threatens very real consequences for crop protection and public health," Potts said. "Right now, the Supreme Court is all that is standing between us and broad new restrictions that will obstruct essential, often time-critical responses to pest and disease outbreaks."

In its petition, the AFBF warns that "even slight delays caused by permit requirements can result in less effective crop protection, the spread of pests and disease, and significant crop loss." The petition also explains that effective mosquito control through pesticide use is our nation's best weapon against mosquito-borne disease, cautioning "anything that significantly curtails the use of pesticides in, over, and near waters threatens public health with outbreaks of West Nile virus, encephalitis, Dengue fever, and other mosquito-borne diseases."

The petition stresses that "few decisions in the history of the CWA have had such a far-reaching and disruptive impact."

Responses to the AFBF petition and friend-of-the-court briefs in support of the petition will be due in early December. The Supreme Court is expected to decide whether to hear the case by the end of the year (2010).

# 2010 Commercial Pesticide Certification Calendar

Here are schedules you can use for planning your training needs during the next several months.

These recertification trainings are structured to give currently certified commercial/public applicators/dealers the information necessary to maintain or renew their certificates in the appropriate categories.

Preregistration is required for all trainings because of material and space limitations. If you do not preregister, you have no guarantee you will get seated at the training.

A *Training Preregistration* form was published in the October *Pesticide Quarterly*. Electronic forms for downloading and printing also are available at <http://ndsupesticide.org>.

## ■ Ground and Aerial for AgPest, Right of Way, Seed Treatment, and Research and Demonstration Recertification

Date	Time	Location
March 3, 2010	Registration 7:30 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Carrington, Research Extension Center, 663 Hwy 281 N.
March 16, 2010	Registration 8 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Crosby, Divide County Extension, 300 2nd Ave. N.
March 16, 2010	Registration 8 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	LaMoure, LaMoure County Courthouse, 202 4th Ave. N.E.
March 16, 2010	Registration 8 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Fessenden, Wells County Extension, 600 Railway St. N.
March 16, 2010	Registration 8 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Wahpeton, Richland County Courthouse, 418 2nd Ave. N.
March 16, 2010	Registration 8 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Watford City, McKenzie County Courthouse, 201 5th St. N.W.
March 23, 2010	Registration 7:30 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Fargo, Ramada Plaza Suites, 1635 42nd St. S.

## ■ Greenhouse, Ornamental and Turf Recertification

Date	Time	Location
Feb. 26, 2010; <i>NCTGA Convention</i>	Registration 7:30 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Fargo, Ramada Plaza Suites, 1635 42nd St. S.
March 18, 2010	Registration 8:30 a.m., Training 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m.	Devils Lake, Ramsey County Courthouse, 524 4th Ave. N.E. #5
March 18, 2010	Registration 8:30 a.m., Training 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m.	Williston, Williams County Courthouse, 205 Broadway E.
March 18, 2010	Registration 7:30 a.m., Training 8 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	Dickinson, Stark County Courthouse, 51 2nd St. E.

## ■ Aerial Applicators Recertification

Date	Time	Location
Feb. 24, 2010	Registration 7:30 a.m., Training 8:30 a.m.-5 p.m.	Fargo, Holiday Inn, 3803 13th Ave. S.

## ■ Public Health Recertification

Date	Time	Location
May 27, 2010	Registration 9 a.m., Training 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Bismarck, Burleigh County Extension, 3715 Bismarck Expressway E.
May 27, 2010	Registration 9 a.m., Training 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Fargo, NDSU, IACC HALL, Room 422
May 27, 2010	Registration 9 a.m., Training 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Grand Forks, County Extension, 51 4th St. S., S302
May 27, 2010	Registration 9 a.m., Training 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m.	Williston, Williams County Courthouse, 205 Broadway E.

## ■ Right of Way ONLY Recertification

May 25, 2010; NDWCA Annual Sprayer School	TBA*	TBA*, Western/Eastern N.D.
May 26, 2010; NDWCA Annual Sprayer School	TBA*	TBA* Western/Eastern N.D.

\*TBA – To Be Announced in a future issue of the *Pesticide Quarterly* newsletter.

# EPA's Interpretation of Farmer Liability Under FIFRA

*Editor's note: The following is an April 12, 2009, response to the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Pesticide Programs from the Office of General Counsel regarding the degree of liability, if any, a grower/farmer has with respect to the actions of a custom-hired pesticide applicator under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). This interpretation was requested by the American Association of Pesticide Control Officials.*

The Office of Pesticide Programs has asked for a legal interpretation from the Office of General Counsel regarding the liability of growers under the FIFRA in circumstances where the growers do not themselves apply a pesticide. The particular question posed was the following: If a grower hires an applicator to apply a pesticide, can the grower be held liable under FIFRA if there is not compliance on the grower's treated land with post-application label requirements, such as preharvest intervals, plant-back restrictions, crop rotation restrictions and restricted-entry intervals? For the following reasons, we believe a grower who hires an applicator or otherwise directs that a pesticide be applied can be held responsible for any violations associated with these post-application requirements. We are not opining on whether, in the interests of justice, it would be appropriate in all circumstances to pursue such enforcement action against a grower; we are merely concluding that enforcement action against the grower can legally be sustained

where post-application violations occur.

- Section 12(a)(2)(G) of FIFRA makes it a violation of the statute for any person "to use any registered pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeling." EPA has historically considered a broad array of activities to fall within the scope of "use" of a pesticide for purposes of 12(a)(2)(G). EPA has permissibly interpreted "use" of a pesticide to include post-application activities such as re-entry, harvesting or planting new crops where those activities may be affected by pesticide residues left over from a pesticide application. If the label of a pesticide conditions its use upon some future action, such as not harvesting a crop before a certain period of time has elapsed since the application, or not entering a field after an application until a certain period of time has elapsed, we believe that non-compliance with the post-application restriction constitutes a violation of 12(a)(2)(G) - the pesticide has been used in a manner inconsistent with its labeling. The question then becomes: Who is responsible for that violation?
- The Environmental Appeals Board has made clear on a number of occasions that FIFRA is a strict liability statute, and therefore arguments based upon lack of knowledge or intent to violate do not provide a defense to liability for violations of the Act. See, e.g., In the Matter of Venguest Trading Inc., 2008 WL 5209465; Docket No.

FIFRA-09-2008-0001 (November 21, 2008); Chempace Corp., 9 E.A.D. 119, 129-130 (EAB 2008).

- Section 14(b)(4) of FIFRA provides that, "[w]hen construing and enforcing the provisions of [FIFRA], the act, omission, or failure of any officer, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any person shall in every case be also deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such person as well as that of the person employed." This provision essentially means that a violation of FIFRA committed by an agent or employee of a person is chargeable to that person as well as to the agent or employee. When a grower commissions a pesticide application by hiring an applicator to perform the application or directing that the application be performed, section 14(b)(4) makes the grower responsible for any violation committed by the applicator.
- Combining section 14(b)(4) with the fact that FIFRA is a strict liability statute, we believe that a grower who hires an applicator to apply a pesticide, or directs that a person apply a pesticide, can be held legally responsible for all use violations associated with the use of that pesticide under section 12(a)(2)(G).

If you have any questions about this memorandum, please feel free to contact me, Robert Pedis, assistant general counsel for pesticides, at (202) 564-5636.

# Audubon of Kansas Claims Pesticides Deadly to Prairie Dogs and Threaten Imperiled Animals

*Editor's Note: To date, most of the Endangered Species Act litigation has been confined to the West Coast. Audubon of Kansas' filing brings this sort of environmental activism to the heartland. The action described in this September 2009 news release means that a court soon may have something to say about how pesticides are used in the Midwest.*

Pesticides used to kill prairie dogs are the target of a lawsuit against the Environmental Protection Agency, which has approved two deadly chemicals, chlorophacinone (Rozol) and diphacinone (Kapat-D), for use in as many as 11 states.

Defenders of Wildlife and Audubon of Kansas are seeking stronger protections today for federally

protected animals that feed on poisoned prairie dogs. In addition to black-footed ferrets, many birds and raptors, including burrowing owls, bald and golden eagles, Swainson's hawks, ferruginous hawks and turkey vultures, are at risk from the use of these chemicals.

Rozol and Kapat-D contain blood-thinning drugs that cause poisoned prairie dogs to slowly bleed to death through "various orifices, including eventually the skin membranes," the Fish and Wildlife Service stated in a letter to the EPA earlier this month.

The poisons can take weeks to finish off an infected prairie dog, during which time the hamsterlike mammal languishes, becoming disoriented and slowly losing bodily function, making it easy prey. Because the chemicals can linger in a prairie dog's carcass for weeks, animals and birds that feed on dead or infected rodents or live in contaminated burrows also can become poisoned inadvertently.

"These chemicals are nasty stuff," said Jason Rylander, an attorney with the Defenders of Wildlife. "The best available science shows that they're inappropriate for widespread use on prairie dogs because of the impacts on threatened and endangered animals. It's unacceptable that the EPA is expanding their use, violating federal wildlife laws, and ignoring all reasonable requests from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state wildlife agencies to limit the use of these poisons. The bottom line is that Rozol and Kapat-D need tighter regulation."

For years, the Fish and Wildlife Service has sought consultation with the EPA under the Endangered Species Act on how to regulate use of the poisons to avoid inadvertently harming black-footed ferrets and

*continued on next page*

---

## Field Pesticide Application Techniques

This past summer, the publication "Field Pesticide Application Techniques in Wisconsin" dropped into my e-mail inbox from my colleague Roger Flashinski at the University of Wisconsin. Ordinarily, these sorts of publications tend to be on the dry side. However, Roger has a great program, so I thought I would review it.

I was rewarded with a publication that is both a practical and useful tool for ground applicators. The publication is targeted to those who are new to the custom application game. The opening paragraphs start out:

*"Okay . . . I have my applicator certification and licensing credentials, I know which pesticide products to apply for the pest problem at hand, and I'm proficient at operating the king-size spray rig that I will be calling my home for the next 3 months . . . I'm all set for tomorrow's first solo job. But, wait a sec. How am I to start that field again?"*

The eight-page publication, complete with excellent color photos, charts and diagrams, methodically leads the reader through a step-by-step

how-to on spraying a field.

The main sections cover:

- I. Arriving at the field** – evaluating the lay of the land and making certain it is the right field
- II. Starting the field** – describes how to open the field, spray corners, charge booms, spray field borders, spray pattern overlap, swath overlap and using foam markers
- III. Finishing the field** – covers row crops, spraying while turning and spraying point rows

The publication was co-authored by Flashinski, UW-Extension Pesticide Applicator Training Program, and Chris Boerboom, former UW-Extension weed scientist, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Agrilance, Agronomy Services and Harold Giddley, Cooperative Services, Denmark, Wis., provided technical support and advice from the professional commercial applicator perspective.

You can download this publication in portable document format at <http://ipcm.wisc.edu/pat/Downloads/tabid/95/Default.aspx>.

# Understanding How Malaria was Eradicated from the U.S.

In last month's PQ, I described how malaria was once a common and serious disease in the U.S. It still is a huge problem worldwide.

Malaria is a mosquito-borne disease caused by a parasite. People with malaria often experience fever, chills and a flulike illness. Left untreated, they may develop severe complications and die. The U.S. Centers for

---

## Audubon of Kansas

*continued from page 6*

other protected mammals and birds. On Sept. 9, 2009, the FWS formally requested that the EPA revoke the pesticides' registrations. The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, representing 23 western states, also has asked the EPA not to approve these pesticides without further environmental review.

"Tons of Rozol have been used in recent years in a misguided attempt to eradicate prairie dogs in some Kansas counties where county commissioners, urged by the Kansas Farm Bureau, are using century-old statutes to force landowners to kill these native mammals on private land," said Ron Klataske, executive director of Audubon of Kansas. "Secondary poisoning with Rozol is a threat to swift foxes, American badgers, ferruginous hawks, golden and bald eagles that frequently feed on prairie dogs in the Great Plains. Black-footed ferrets rely almost exclusively on prairie dogs for food."

Rozol is approved for use to poison prairie dogs in Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas and Wyoming. The EPA allows Kaput-D to be used on prairie dogs in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Texas and Wyoming.

Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that more than half the world population lives in areas where malaria is endemic, 350 million to 500 million cases of malaria occur worldwide each year and more than 1 million people (most of them young children in sub-Saharan Africa) die.

This month, I thought I would follow up with the story of how malaria was eradicated. As you might expect, it was a multidisciplinary approach conducted for a number of years by city, state and federal government agencies. Before World War II, most malaria control efforts were focused on draining mosquito breeding sites, treating stagnant water bodies with diesel oil to prevent mosquito reproduction, spaying adult mosquitoes with naturally purified pyrethroid insecticides, and treating victims with tree bark-derived quinine.

By the 1930s, malaria was confined to the 13 southeastern states. This in itself was a major achievement because, before coordinated efforts were undertaken, malaria was found to be transmitted by mosquitoes throughout the Midwest and along the eastern seaboard as far north as Massachusetts. In the 1930s, malaria peaked at about 130 cases per 100,000 people in the population.

Soon after World War II began, British and U.S. scientists, in collaboration with the Swiss, were able to manufacture DDT (Dichlorodiphenyl-trichloroethane) insecticide. During the war, it was put to use primarily to protect soldiers from insect-borne diseases, including malaria. These efforts largely were successful, but a significant number of service personnel still contracted malaria while serving overseas. Thus, toward the end of the war,

public health agencies were concerned that the return of malaria-infected servicemen would result in a major epidemic in the U.S. Health officials were very concerned that the disease once again could be a problem outside of the southeastern U.S.

In late 1945 and into 1946, DDT soon was directed toward the control of malaria. The historical methods were abandoned. Soon efforts concentrated upon the use of indoor residual DDT sprays in areas where endemic malaria was known to be present or had been reported recently.

In a 1950s report, the CDC wrote:

*The principle of this new program was very simple. Instead of trying to reduce the general abundance of anopheline mosquitoes, lethal measures were aimed specifically at the small proportion of anopheline that actually bite man. If these could be killed before they had the opportunity to bite human beings a second time, malaria could not be transmitted. The success of this procedure had already been well-demonstrated in various parts of the world.*

*In 1945, a total of 62,763 cases of malaria was reported in the United States; 78 percent of these occurred in the 13 "traditionally malarious" states. By the end of 1949, over 4,650,000 house spray applications of DDT had been made. In 1947, 15,000 malaria cases were reported. By 1950, only 2,000 cases were reported. By 1951, malaria was considered eradicated from the United States.*

The results of these efforts were nothing short of remarkable, especially when one considers that the disease still rages in many places around the world. In last month's article, I wondered if our society or our pesticide regulatory structure would allow us to eradicate a pest problem such as malaria. I'm still wondering.

North Dakota State University  
Agriculture Communication  
NDSU Dept. 7070  
P.O. Box 6050  
Fargo, ND 58108-6050

Non Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage

**Paid**

Permit No. 818  
Fargo, N. Dak.

Address Service Requested



This newsletter may be copied for noncommercial, educational purposes in its entirety with no changes.

Requests to use any portion of the document (including text, graphics or photos) should be sent to [NDSU.permission@ndsu.edu](mailto:NDSU.permission@ndsu.edu). Include exactly what is requested for use and how it will be used.

## Training Opportunities for New Applicators/Dealers

### “Introductory Basic Core Training”

The training is designed for commercial or public applicators and dealers who are new to pesticide certification in North Dakota. It will cover basic pesticide safety and handling practices, as well as relevant laws and regulations as they pertain to the distribution and use of pesticides. This training is not category specific. It will emphasize practices and procedures that should be useful to all applicators or dealers, whether they are seeking certification in the Agricultural Pest Control category, Wood Preservation category or any of the 10 other use categories found in North Dakota. The training also will describe the certification process and how to

prepare and take exams to obtain a pesticide certificate.

We will offer these trainings live and in real time via the Internet to any location that can receive a Windows Media Video Stream at 300 kbps or higher using Windows Media Video Version 9.0 or higher. For practical purposes, people who have a dial-up connection will not be able to participate in this training.

To test your connection, go to:

[www.ag.ndsu.nodak.edu/aginfo/pesticid/myth.htm](http://www.ag.ndsu.nodak.edu/aginfo/pesticid/myth.htm)

If you can view the Richard Zollinger videos, your computer and location will be able to connect to our webcast.

People who wish to participate should call the NDSU Pesticide Training and Certification Program office at (701) 231-7180 or (701) 231-6388 to preregister. Preregister at least 10 days before the training date so we can ship training materials and send you your confirmation information (this will include the Web location URL along with login instructions).

Date	Time	Location
March 1, 2010	Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. CST	Statewide via Internet videocast
April 12, 2010	Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. CDT	Statewide via Internet videocast
June 4, 2010	Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. CDT	Statewide via Internet videocast