# 2009 WSSA Committee Report to Members Summary for 2009 and Action Plan for 2010

Committee Code and Name: Herbicides for Minor Uses (E10)

**Committee Chair:** Roger Batts, North Carolina State University (roger\_batts@ncsu.edu)

Board Coordinator: Mike Barrett

#### **Committee Members Rotating Off:**

Several chose to stay, while others decided to rotate off or now have responsibilities that don't include minor crops.

Current Roster:	
Arsenovic, Marija (NE)**	Fennimore, Steve (W)
Batts, Roger (S)*	MacRae, Andrew (S)
Bellinder, Robin (NE)	Miller, Tim (W)
Colquhoun, Jed (NC)	Monks, David (S)
Culpepper, Stanley (S)	O'Sullivan, John (C)
Doohan, Doug (NC)	Wallace, Russ (S)
Felix, Joel (W)	Zollinger, Richard (NC)

\*Chair \*\*IR-4 Herbicide Coordinator and ex-offico

## Appropriate Replacements: See roster

#### **2009 Summary of Activities**

<u>What were the committee's goals for 2009?</u> To discuss and coordinate important issues related to weed management in minor crops and herbicide registration issues, as well as potential sustainable production.

List the committee's accomplishments in 2009:

The HMUC met for two 45-minute sessions at the 2009 IR-4 Food Use Workshop (FUW). These sessions were not limited to HMUC members, as they were part of the FUW agenda. Committee members present were: Batts, Arsenovic, Bellinder, Doohan, Monks, and Zollinger.

Topics of discussion included the following:

Discussed with representatives from EPA if there are any guidelines regarding the number of greenhouse residue trials or ratio of field:greenhouse trials required for a crop that may be grown in both of these environments. EPA personnel stated that they knew of no such rules, but suggested that IR-4 contact the Chemistry Science Advisory Committee (CHEMSAC) at EPA's Health Evaluation Division (HED) for guidance on this in the future. IR-4 probably also needs to ask if there

are guidelines regarding ratio of seeded:transplanted trials in situations where the crop in question can be produced in both manners.

- Indemnification labeling was discussed. There is on ongoing effort with EPA and manufacturers to resolve wording issues on these types of labels.
- Much discussion occurred on the registration review for fomesafen, particularly the Ecological Risk and Endangered Species Assessment published by EPA. Both EPA and Syngenta representatives agree that this is still in the early stages and more communication between these parties will be occurring. There is concern among some of the weed specialists that the large buffers suggested in this review may set a precedence for future compounds and that the weed science community should stay aware of and give input on how this particular review is to be resolved.
- Dow explained that oxyfluorfen is on hold at EPA and any movement of oxyfluorfen registrations would probably not happen for nearly a year.
- Robin Bellinder has looked at several herbicides for safety in transplanted basil. Safety was seen with a majority of the products she evaluated. Along those lines, IR-4 had at least 3 crop safety/performance trial sites evaluating napropamide at 1X and 2X rates applied preemergence in 2009. It was mentioned that napropamide has 24c registrations for seeded basil in California and Illinois. Bellinder plans on sharing her data at next HMUC meeting (Denver, Feb 2010)
- Dr. Bellinder also discussed her trials with saflufenacil (Kixor) applied at 0.045 lb ai/a pretransplant to perennial strawberries. She saw good broadleaf weed control and no injury to the berries. She also likes it for weed control when applied to dormant berries.
- Pendimethalin projects that have tolerance established but the crop is not yet on BASF's marketing label was revisited. Several researchers conducted trials in 2009 to try to provide BASF with data on these. Cabbage and Broccoli were the primary focus in 2009, both inside the company and with several university sites. BASF mentioned that if all data was clean it would simply be a matter of adding to the label. If some data was questionable, BASF stated it may be possible to exclude certain situations (i.e., soil OM%, certain textures, etc.) when adding one of these crops to the label. All researchers were encouraged to forward any data on these crops to the company as well as IR-4 HQ. Note: IR-4 had crop safety/performance trial sites for pendimethalin/green onion in 2009 for to help generate data for a registration decision to be made.
- Use of s-metolachlor in tomatoes was brought up. Dual Magnum label for tomatoes lists a 90 day PHI. This concerned many in the meeting because tomatoes are not typically a 90+ day crop. California has 24c label for 60 day PHI. It was also mentioned that the residue trials conducted for this use were done with a 30 day PHI
- As of 2009, pronamide (Kerb) can not be used on leaf lettuce. During recent reregistration, EPA listed only head lettuce because old residue trials apparently were only done on head lettuce. Dow and IR-4 questioned this and EPA said more residue trials will be required. IR-4 conducted 8 residue trials on leaf lettuce in 2003. This data, and possibly more from Dow, will probably go to agency this winter.
- Arsenovic stated that Tessenderlo Kerley, Inc. (TKI) now has linuron and that they are willing to support any possible label expansions.

 The possibility of prohexadione calcium (Apogee) use on strawberries was brought up by Kathy Demchak, Penn State. Several others, including representatives from Canada, added their interest and comment on this. This use would be for reduction of runners in annual berries grown on plastic mulch in northern climates to help control runner growth and help gain large berry size, according to Edith Lurvey. David Monks said that he and Katie Jennings had seen inconsistent results from Apogee in a couple of North Carolina trials.

During November and December, much e-mail communication occurred with the committee focused on herbicides for spinach. Researchers brought up new herbicides and rates that have investigated. More sharing of information on this and other topics is planned at WSSA - Denver

What information was posted on the WSSA website? I am aware of none.

<u>How much funds were requested?</u> How much was spent? I am aware of no fund requests or expenditures made by this committee.

What was the impact of the committee activities/accomplishments on the following: membership, publication, policy, legislation, and/or education? HMUC members are engaged in the USDA IR-4 Project, which coordinates testing and data submission to US EPA to help growers of these high-value, small-acreage crops obtain new herbicidal tools. Many of our members also hold extension appointments at their institutions and are in excellent positions to share research weed control findings directly with growers.

<u>What is the current state of the committee's projects and activities?</u> The HMUC is highly active in its pursuit of weed control solutions for minor/specialty crop production. Through direct meetings and other communications, we share data and ideas on new weed control solutions. Cooperation and communication from researchers across all regions of the country is particularly strong in this committee.

## 2010 Plan for Committee Activities

<u>Goals for 2010</u>: To continue to identify and resolve weed control issues in minor/specialty crops.

<u>Plan of Action</u>: Through direct meetings (IR-4, WSSA, and others) and through intra-committee correspondence, issues can be identified and through data and idea exchange, resolutions can reached through a consolidated approach.

<u>What is needed to further the goals of the committee/project?</u> Continued participation in the committee by members and other interested parties is critical. This may include identification of emerging weed control problems as well as data exchange on weed control agents. Communication with regulatory agencies on weed control issues involving specialty crops will also be essential.

# **Recommendations for Board/Society Action:**

Funds requested for 2010: None

Other requests for the Board: None