

Message

From: FEIKEMA, ALVIN B [AG-Contractor/1000] [alvin.b.feikema@monsanto.com]
Sent: 11/7/2017 2:43:40 PM
To: TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] [jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com]
Subject: Re: Another question

Saw the BASF comment; using AMS doesn't surprise me in the least; your comment about the fines is new information for me; almost need the state Ag dept out there watching those b.....s's spray. I did talk to SD AG Dept weed director about generics, etc.'s and asked why they were not being the scope of ant scrutiny...he was strangely quiet on that topic but quite vocal on why we need the dicamba boost for resistant weeds

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 7, 2017, at 2:34 PM, TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] <jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com> wrote:

Right on! Stressed plants can't grow through the dicamba exposure, where healthy beans shrug it off quickly. Beans really can't metabolize dicamba, they just have to dilute it. They healthier they are, the faster they grow and the faster they look great.

Did you see that BASF says they only sold enough Eugenia in AR for 51% of the Xtend crops? Assuming 25% of that was "defensive soybeans" let's say that 25% of them cowboys used the cheap shit. \$4 to \$6 bucks less an acre for generic shit. If you noted in the volatility discussion, it takes about 40 ppt of dicamba to cause 5% malformation...and there's no way that Xtendimax air concentrations get that high.

Cowboys using the cheap shit will use AMS. Save's a lot of money compared to the new NonAMS water conditioners. That mixture pumps out 330 ppt of dicamba. Then let's argue whether or not the cowboys give a shit about the right nozzle. They heard about the weed control complaints. So they use a TT or at best, an AIXR. The TT pumps out 16% fines, the AIXR 8%.

The combination of vapor and driftable fines is what causes the wall to wall damage we've been seeing. Plus, you've got to be at least 500 ft away from soybeans just to protect yourself from Xtendimax drift.

Agree?

From: FEIKEMA, ALVIN B [AG-Contractor/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 1:22 PM
To: TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] <jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com>
Subject: Re: Another question

I don't recall seeing a word of "other" sources of dicamba; I have seen in print many references to Xtendimax, Engenia, and Fexopan. There may be references to "other" sources but I have not seen them. Looking at contentious individuals with affected beans it appears to me they have gone to the blame game searching for "closest to the eye or the foot" or "who has the money". One major retailer in my area has good evidence of a grower using "generic" forms of dicamba. Some fields adjacent to generic applications virtually wiped out. Too many situations where wind direction was not favorable to drift onto affected fields coupled with leaf tests that show a very low level of dicamba...not enough to be a direct drifting situation. Of course, after the physical evidence from the field became apparent, very few applicators of "other" sources of dicamba (if any, in my area) came forward with their hand in the air stating "yeah, it was me". So still lots of questions out here; firmly believe drought in Dakotas greatly contributed to a more severe symptomology. Comparing "well watered" areas in southwestern MN...there was no comparison...i.e....some slight wrinkling, retention of deep green color-no

discoloration, and very, very little cupping apparent. No extreme cupping (little teacups), pale green discoloration, or stunted growth and height.

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 7, 2017, at 1:00 PM, TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] <jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com> wrote:

Al,

You are correct. They aren't necessarily generic, though, more "branded". The generics would be a ton of DMA type and DGA brands that are sold by the smaller players. And no Vapor Grip in those.

Status in corn can really screw up soybeans because it contains that second ingredient that really heats up the dicamba.

I don't understand your ag press comment!

Jeff

From: FEIKEMA, ALVIN B [AG-Contractor/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 12:55 PM
To: TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] <jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com>
Subject: Re: Another question

Just a question....what about "generic" dicamba sources as well as Status & Clarity herbicides...not aware any of these have any "VaporGrip" safeguards. Don't hear much about these as potential sources; do the manufacturers of these have the ag press "over the barrel"? ?

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 7, 2017, at 7:18 AM, TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] <jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com> wrote:

Hello Al,

Reviewing your reply in detail and I note your question. The vast majority of what we are seeing for OTM is that particle drift at the time of spraying is causing at least 80%, probably more, of the situations. Adjacent fields are downwind, and even with 200 to 300 ft of buffer, beans are affected.

Volatility situations are actually rare. Recall from training that the first 24 hrs produces the maximum vapor dose, and winds have to be blowing toward the affected field for vapor to "land". If that criteria isn't met it's virtually impossible to claim volatility. I'm seeing tons of downwind drift situations, where an applicator says SOUTH winds, but the weather analyses say South East winds, and the OTM is indeed to the West and NW of the source field. The apps are simply not accurate enough.

That's the point of the work I'm doing.

Confidential

MON0651398

Thanks for your feedback.

Jeff

From: FEIKEMA, ALVIN B [AG-Contractor/1000]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 3:04 PM
To: TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000]
<jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com>
Subject: Re: Another question

Please reference photo "Schliesner west side of 80 acres" attached to inquiry #36089...damaged field is east across gravel road & 2 wide ditches from source field (visible on right side of photo w/electric line adjacent to road). Source field is west of gravel road. North & south boundaries of both fields are even-south boundary is another gravel road with ditches; north boundary is 2 fence lines on east and west side of road. No planimeter photo available; I updated my Planimeter App and apparently some of the photos from that time period did travel along for the ride.

Question I have...are we going on the presumption there was either drift or volatility from the "source" field? I had (perhaps) 1-2 situations out of over 80 inquiries where drift was a plausible cause for field damage; which leaves volatility as a major factor if we presume the "source" field to be the responsible source.

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 25, 2017, at 1:28 PM, TRAVERS, JEFF N [AG-Contractor/1000] <jeff.n.travers@monsanto.com> wrote:

Hello Al,

For inquiry 170036089 there are good photos showing what appears to be tank contamination, due to the clean line of damaged vs ok soy.

But, can you review your notes and tell me if where the damaged field is in relation to the source field. A new planimeter map would be great, too.

Thanks for your help.

Jeff