Case: 19-70115, 08/13/2019, ID: 11396549, DktEntry: 36-3, Page 104 of 246

Message

Sent: 8/22/2018 8:57:30 PM

To: Gere, Tom [Tom.Gere@state.sd.us]

Subject: update

Hi Tom,

DO you have a good sense of any

REUBEN BARIS | PRODUCT MANAGER, TEAM 25 | HERBICIDE BRANCH
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, OFFICE OF PESTICIDE PROGRAMS | (703) 305-7356

From: Gere, Tom [mailto:Tom.Gere@state.sd.us] Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 11:50 AM

To: Baris, Reuben <Baris.Reuben@epa.gov>; Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>

Cc: Farley, Joseph <Joseph.Farley@state.sd.us>; Kinard, Sherrie <Kinard.Sherrie@epa.gov>; Wood, MelanieL

<Wood.MelanieL@epa.gov>; Jacobson, Bruce <Bruce.Jacobson@state.sd.us>

Subject: Dicamba volatility_8-21-2018.docx

Hey Reuben and Dan,

South Dakota put together some thoughts on Dicamba and what is going on here in South Dakota. I believe most all of the states are in agreement that this weed control option is a needed tool, but there are a lot of problems that the registrants are not willing to address. Volatility being one of the issues. The dicamba chemistry had problems with volatility. South Dakota has over 5 million acres of soybeans. Fifty percent are roughly dicamba tolerant. If 3% of those acres have a volatility issue that would equate to over 150,000 acres in SD where the product did not stay put for various reasons.

The EPA weekly calls have been helpful and we all have the same story with 50% or greater of drift complaints pertain to a possible dicamba issue.

Thanks,



Tom Gere, C.C.A Assistant Director South Dakota Department of Agriculture Agricultural Services Division

523 East Capitol Ave Pierre, SD 57501 Direct: 605.773.4432 Fax:605.773.3481 sdda.sd.gov