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Pristine and Endura Labeled

David Langston
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Pristine and Endura are new BASF fungicides that recently were labeled in Georgia. Pristine is a premix of pyraclostrobin (active ingredient in Cabrio) and boscolid (active ingredient in Endura). These two new products cover a wide range of crops and diseases. Probably the most significant thing gained with these new labels is the excellent gummy stem blight suppression demonstrated by Pristine. However, Pristine should NEVER be used in the greenhouse for any reason or we risk having resistance develop to that class of chemistry very rapidly. The same goes for Endura. Check each label very carefully to determine the crops covered by each. Attached are three labels that address these new materials.

2003 Legislative Changes Affect Agriculture in Georgia

Kerry Harrison
Extension Ag. Engineer - UGA

The 2003 Georgia Legislative Session was headed to be the Water Session before there was a change in Governors. Everyone waited and wondered what would happen. As it turned out, the major focus was on HB 237 called the Comprehensive Water Plan. The media talked a lot about this bill and when a joint conference committee proposal was voted down at the last minute; everyone assumed that there would be no water related legislation this year.

However, there is another bill that was introduced and passed that will immediately affect the way farmers do business. HB 579 requires that all agricultural withdrawals of water be metered. This bill designates the Georgia Soil & Water Conservation Commission (SWCC) as the agency to coordinate the metering efforts.

The major points of HB 579 is that it designates the SWCC as the agency to purchase, install, read, maintain and report data findings for the agricultural metering program in Georgia. All withdrawals are to be metered by the year 2009. The installation of the metering devices will be coordinated with DNR. Basically that means that critical use areas will be instrumented first. Since this happened very suddenly; the SWCC is still in the development stage in getting information out.
However, the legislation answers many of the most frequently asked questions received at the county level. That is, the SWCC will purchase all the meters (at least for those permits obtained before July 1, 2003). This means that the meter belongs to the state (not the farmer). The SWCC is responsible for the installation of the meter. The SWCC is responsible for the maintenance on the meter. If it tears up, there would be someone that would be called to fix it. Exactly how all this will develop is what is being discussed at the SWCC state office. The SWCC is responsible for reading the meters (that means they are authorized to enter the property where the device is located). And finally, the SWCC is responsible for putting the readings together and reporting these figures on water use to DNR. Again, this applies to permits issued BEFORE July 1, 2003.

There will obviously be a lot of information to come from the SWCC later this year. The particular answers related to What device are they going to use?; Who will be installing the device on my system?; and Who do I call to report problems? will come later.

You can get a copy of the legislation by going to the State of Georgia web site:


---

**MBr Critical Use Exemption Update**

Terry Kelley  
Extension Horticulturist - UGA

Six applications for critical use exemption for Georgia vegetable producers in 2005 to the methyl bromide phaseout were submitted to EPA on September 9, 2002. The application was submitted by the Georgia Fruit & Vegetable Growers Association and was prepared by GFVGA in cooperation with University of Georgia vegetable extension specialists. Dr. David B. Langston, Jr., Dr. Greg Fonsah, Dr. Stanely Culpepper, Dr. Terry Kelley and George Ponder (GFVGA) prepared the applications.

The Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) has not yet completed their ruling on that application. The application for 2006 was prepared and submitted on August 8. The quantities (lbs) and acreage requested for each application are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>GA requested</th>
<th>EPA submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melon</td>
<td>4,044</td>
<td>541,762</td>
<td>541,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomato</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>798,640</td>
<td>366,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>5,565</td>
<td>745,710</td>
<td>223,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>204,752</td>
<td>204,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cucumber</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>148,204</td>
<td>148,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggplant</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>107,736</td>
<td>32,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These applications were based on these particular crops being the first crop in a two- or three-crop system in each fumigation cycle. The acreages only represent those acres of each crop that are produced using plastic mulch with drip irrigation.

Georgia’s applications were based on the premise that there is no alternative to methyl bromide that is technically feasible for the control of yellow and purple nutsedge. While it was acknowledged that Georgia also uses Mbr for the control of nematodes and soil borne diseases, the team could not refute the feasibility of 1,3-dichloropropene (Telone), metam sodium and chloropicrin for these problems.

The second application included two additional factors. The Telone label prohibits the use of that product on soils overlaying Karst topography. Anywhere from eight to 26% of these crops are produced on such soils. Also, labeled waiting periods between application and planting with Telone and metam interfere with timely planting of these crops, particularly in the fall.

The amounts proposed by EPA covered 100% of the amount requested for the cucurbit crops, but only 30% of that requested for the solanaceous crops. This was due to the fact that EPA misinterpreted our assertion of a 30-40% yield loss without Mbr to be 30-40% of our acres would be affected. Obviously, that is not the same thing. We have brought this to the attention of the EPA representatives, but they have not as yet altered their requested amounts.

MBTOC’s initial ruling on the 2005 application was that EPA did not provide enough information for them to complete their decision. Since that time, EPA has submitted a response to MBTOC to provide that information. Most of the information that MBTOC requested was in the application packages that Georgia submitted to EPA. However, the Georgia team provided input to EPA regarding their response. MBTOC will complete their decision later this year.
The final stakeholder meeting on the allocation process was on August 15, 2003. While it seems likely that MBTOC will allocate some level of critical use exemption, the allocation process has not been finalized nor have the allocated amounts to individual applicants. The allocation process will be decided by EPA in the near future. They are considering several allocation procedures, some of which would not be favorable for Georgia growers. The most favorable model is the QPS (Quarentine Pre-Shipment) model which is an established method that has been used for QPS allocation in the past. This would be the easiest method to implement and would likely put allocation in the hands of distributors. A model where allotments are auctioned off to growers by EPA is also under consideration. This would simply add cost to the program with no additional benefit to the grower.