



Surface Water Monitoring Survey

Jessica Johnson,
Environmental Programs Specialist,
North Dakota Department of Agriculture

The North Dakota Department of Agriculture, working in cooperation with the North Dakota Department of Health, coordinated a surface water monitoring survey in 2009 to assess levels of pesticides and pesticide degradates in North Dakota rivers.

Twenty-nine sites, representing all major watersheds of North Dakota,

were sampled and tested for 180 different pesticides and pesticide degradates every six weeks from June through November. There were a total of 11 detections of four different pesticides (atrazine, bentazon, dimethenamid and MCPA). Common trade names of these pesticides are Aatrex, Basagran, Frontier and MCP. The most commonly detected pesticides were the herbicides atrazine and bentazon, detected four and three times, respectively. MCPA and dimethenamid were each detected twice.

For all pesticides, concentrations **were significantly below** levels deemed harmful by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). According to these standards, the concentrations of pesticides found in North Dakota rivers and streams are not a risk to human health and the environment.

Results show that North Dakota streams and rivers have minimal pesticide contamination. All of the pesticide detections were in the eastern edge of the state and in the Red River or its tributaries.

The state now has three years of surface water sampling for pesticides in North Dakota. Results from these surveys show that North Dakota rivers and streams have minimal pesticide contamination. This is a good sign for the environment and producers and others who rely on pesticides.

This project is the only statewide comprehensive surface water monitoring project for pesticides in North Dakota. Quality data on pesticide concentrations and their occurrence in surface water allows the North Dakota Department of Agriculture to better protect surface water resources from pesticides while not imposing unnecessary burdens on pesticide users.

Without surface water data, federal agencies such as the EPA often use conservative models that tend to overestimate the concentrations of pesticides in surface water. Because of a lack of surface water monitoring data, these models often are used for decision making for policies such as setback areas from surface water on labels, potential National Pollutant Discharge Eliminations Systems (NPDES) permits and Endangered Species Bulletins. With more data from projects such as this one, EPA could rely on real-world data instead of models for policy decisions.

In this issue . . .

Surface Water Monitoring Survey	1
An Increased Focus on Pesticide Use Near Surface Water	2
Coordinator's Comments	2
AGDAKOTA	3
Project Safe Send Dates and Locations Announced	4
Container Recycling Opportunities	4
NDSU's Crop and Pest Report: A Weekly Newsletter for Farmers and Agricultural Professionals	5
Introductory Basic Core Training	5
Controlling Bedbugs With DDT: A Historical Perspective	6
CropLife America Files Request to Intervene in Polar Bear Lawsuit	7
Polar Bears Poisoned by Pesticide Pollution: Lawsuit Filed Against EPA to Protect Arctic From Pesticide Contamination	7

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

Web: www.ndsupesticide.org

An Increased Focus on Pesticide Use Near Surface Water

Jim Gray, Director of the Agricultural Chemicals Division
North Dakota Department of Agriculture

These are certainly interesting times for pesticide applicators, growers and others in the pesticide industry. Hardly a week goes by that I don't learn of a new lawsuit or new labeling proposal dealing with protecting surface water, endangered species or other sensitive sites from pesticides. It is evident that there are citizens in this country (and in this state) who are genuinely concerned about how pesticides are used and regulated.

Additional pesticide use restrictions around surface water is a major issue for states like North Dakota with wetlands interspersed throughout agricultural fields. As a result, I and others at the North Dakota Department of Agriculture are spending an increasing amount of time monitoring the Federal Register, talking to congressional staff and stakeholder groups, and working with EPA to develop label language that is adequately protective, yet does not unnecessarily burden users.

Please allow me to update you on several issues related to pesticide use near surface water that could have significant impacts to North Dakota.

NPDES Permits

This issue centers on a U.S. Court of Appeals decision in early 2009 on the case *National Cotton Council v. U.S. EPA* that centers on jurisdictional overlap between FIFRA (the predominant federal pesticide law) and the Clean Water Act (CWA). The court upheld an activist suit alleging that pesticides can be considered to be "pollutants" under the CWA, even if the user complies with the product labeling and other provisions of FIFRA. The court ordered EPA to strike its 2006 rule that had exempted pesticides from many provisions of the CWA when those pesticides were used "in," "on" or "near" surface water. EPA has until April 9, 2011, to comply.

After April 9, 2011, pesticide users applying pesticide in, on or near surface water could be in violation of the CWA unless they obtain or are covered under a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. NPDES permits are issued in this state by the North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH), and the NDDH issues a number of these every year to factories, wastewater treatment plants and other types industries that discharge pollutants into water. The challenge is to design an NPDES permit that is applicable to pesticide users.

The plan is for EPA to develop a general NPDES permit that would cover general types of pesticide uses. People using pesticides under those general patterns could simply add their name to the permit. While the details of the general permit are still being resolved by NDDH and EPA,

Coordinator's Comments

We are wrapping up another training season, and with the snow drifts disappearing, that means spring is here!

I am happy to report that we managed to deliver all of our trainings this season in good order, though we had some pretty close calls with a couple of winter storms and rising floodwaters. All and all, it was a great season and a genuine privilege and pleasure to be able to work with so many dedicated and enthusiastic professionals.

While you folks keep my spirits up, a number of storm clouds are gathering for the pesticide industry. Not the least of these is the ever-increasing trend by environmental activist groups to sue the Environmental Protection Agency for some perceived deficiency regarding how pesticides are being regulated. Now the Center for Biological Diversity is charging foul with regard to protecting polar bears from pesticides. I first heard of this when a friend sent me an e-mail regarding the lawsuit back in December. I thought it was a joke or

some worthless solicitation about a long-lost uncle having \$1 million set aside for me in some foreign country.

However, it is real and it is no joke. In this issue of the PQ, I am printing the announcement of the lawsuit and a recent response from CropLife America.

On the plus side, the North Dakota Department of Agriculture has some good news about pesticide monitoring in our surface waters. Without stealing the department's thunder, it reports that our water quality is excellent and pesticide contamination is not a serious problem. Also, Project Safe Send is set for July, and a container recycling effort is being organized. So we have much to look forward to.

Until the next issue of the PQ, have a great spray season.

Best regards,



Andrew A. Thostenson,
Pesticide Program Specialist

the intent is to focus the permit on those pesticide applications made directly in or on water. At the time of this writing, the general permit covers four types of uses: A) aquatic insect and mosquito control, B) aquatic weed and algae control, C) aquatic nuisance species control such as fish and zebra mussels, and D) wide area pest control such as aerial applications over forests to manage insects. The general permit is silent when it comes to agricultural uses, although most CWA experts agree that the court's ruling likely covers uses "near" water. Some agricultural users also may want to be permitted to protect themselves from citizen lawsuits.

As you will see, we have more questions than we have answers on this issue. The NDDH is working hard to find a solution that will meet that court's ruling without being unnecessarily burdensome. In the next few months, we should have a better idea of how a permitting system would work, how much it will cost and other logistic issues. People should continue to ask questions and get educated on this issue since it could dramatically affect how pesticides are used in the state.

Endangered Species Bulletins

Also in response to citizen lawsuits, EPA is looking at ways to better protect threatened and endangered species from pesticides. As a first step, EPA is implementing new use restrictions for chlorpyrifos, diazinon and malathion in Washington, Idaho, Oregon and California. The details are still being worked out, but there certainly will be use restrictions in those states above and beyond what's on the pesticide label. Proposals include use buffers of 100 to 1,000 feet between use sites and certain surface waters, not only including salmon habitat, but also streams and irrigation canals flowing into salmon

habitat. Some estimates suggest that this could take significant amounts of land out of agricultural production. Although these sorts of restrictions are not yet contemplated for North Dakota, this model likely will be expanded to cover other endangered species habitats in other states.

Pyrethroid Label Language

In early 2008, EPA contacted registrants of more than 50 products containing one or more of 10 agricultural pyrethroids to revise their labeling to better protect surface water. Pyrethroids are insecticides that go by such names as Warrior, Mustang and Capture. In their letter, EPA ordered these companies to add label use restrictions establishing use buffers around "aquatic habitats" such as wetlands and lakes to protect aquatic ecosystems. Use buffers range from 25 feet for ground applications up to 450 feet for ultralow-volume aerial uses. Many people are concerned about the impact to North Dakota agriculture from these restrictions, especially in prairie pothole country. I am, too, since these are enforceable restrictions.

Moving Ahead

As you hopefully will gather, there are people in this country concerned about impacts of pesticides to surface water. Some of these people are well-intentioned, concerned citizens, while others are activists focused on largely eliminating pesticide use. What is a person to do?

I will tell you that the North Dakota Department of Agriculture is engaged on these issues, and we will continue to offer input and recommendations to EPA. My standard argument to EPA is that there is an acceptable level of risk to the environment if people comply with the label. This begs the obvious question as to whether most applicators do read and follow the

label. Therefore, the onus on the part of users is to show that they are using pesticides responsibly and legally. In addition, labels are beginning to include site-specific, chemical-specific and technology-specific use restrictions, and it is more important than ever to thoroughly read the label to stay in compliance.

If you have questions on label language, please do not hesitate to contact the North Dakota Department of Agriculture. We can explain what label language means and what statements are enforceable. Compliance with labeling will not only keep you out of regulatory hot water, but also provide more ammo for us to argue that further use restrictions are unnecessary.

AGDAKOTA

For 20-plus years, NDSU's AGDAKOTA e-mail listserv has provided timely sharing of information on crop production issues. Topics include disease, insect and weed control strategies. It also covers agronomy and soil fertility management. Finally, if you want information on what's new with late-breaking pesticide issues, AGDAKOTA is a must-have.

The electronic mail listserv serves more than 500 farmers, ranchers, dealers, researchers, Extension educators and state regulators across the northern Plains. To sign up for this free listserv, send an e-mail to the manager of the list, NDSU Extension weed specialist Richard Zollinger. His address is r.zollinger@ndsu.edu. Simply indicate in your note that you wish to subscribe to AGDAKOTA.

Project Safe Send Dates and Locations Announced

Project Safe Send is a North Dakota Department of Agriculture program to help farmers and the general public get rid of unusable pesticides safely and legally. This 18-year-old program is safe, simple and nonregulatory.

According to Agriculture Commissioner Doug Goehring, "Project Safe Send provides a valuable service to agriculture producers, agribusiness and the public in disposing of outdated or unusable pesticides."

The program accepts any pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, rodenticides and fungicides) that are old, unusable or banned and is open to the public, including farmers, ranchers, pesticide dealers and applicators, government agencies and homeowners. After the collections, hazardous pesticides are packed carefully and shipped out of state for incineration. Project Safe Send is funded through the fees paid by pesticide manufacturers to register their products in North Dakota.

Please check your storage areas for any unusable pesticides and set them aside for Project Safe Send. In the meantime,

keep pesticides locked up safely. If you have deteriorating or leaking containers, pack them in larger containers and add absorbent materials. Free heavy-duty plastic bags are available from the North Dakota Department of Agriculture.

People with more than 1,000 pounds of pesticides should preregister. No other preregistration is required. A maximum of 20,000 pounds of pesticide per participant will be accepted. Pesticide rinse water also will be accepted at any of the 12 collection sites. The first 100 pounds of rinse water will be taken free of charge; a fee will be applied for each additional pound.

If you would like to preregister more than 1,000 pounds of pesticides, want to receive heavy-duty plastic bags or have questions about Project Safe Send, contact Jessica Johnson at the North Dakota Department of Agriculture at (800) 242-7535 or jjjohnson@nd.gov.

See the schedule below with dates and locations. The collections will run from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. local time.

Container Recycling Opportunities

Does your company generate large volumes of empty crop-protection containers? Are you looking for a disposal option that demonstrates environmental stewardship and is convenient? Container Services Network LLC (CSN), www.container-services-network.com, might have the perfect solution for your business.

CSN is the approved Ag Container Recycling Council (www.acrecycle.org) contractor for the Midwest and is looking for agribusinesses and other organizations interested in becoming a recycling site. The company offers year-round service to pick up containers at no cost when adequate quantities are available. CSN recycles triple-rinsed HDPE crop protection containers up to 55 gallon in capacity. Recycling sites can be open to the public or be limited to private use.

Container Services Network provides program participants with large plastic bags to store their clean, properly rinsed containers until pickup. At the time of pickup, the bags will be loaded directly onto a CSN truck; this eliminates noisy onsite chipping. CSN will coordinate with each agribusiness organization and collection point to schedule pickups. Collection sites and applicators will be notified 48 hours prior to their scheduled pickup date.

For more information on the program, contact Gary Glickman of CSN at (866) 225-6629 or gglickman@container-services-network.com.

Location	Date	Address and directions
New England	July 7, 2010	11704 61st St. S.W. – east side of junction of N.D. Highways 21 and 22 just south of New England
Watford City	July 8, 2010	11th Ave. S.W. – on U.S. Highway 85, ¾ mile south of junction of U.S. Highway 85 and N.D. Highway 23, west side of 85
Crosby	July 9, 2010	10320 119th Ave. N.W. – northeast corner of N.D. Highway 5 and County Highway 42 intersection, on west edge of Crosby
Minot	July 12, 2010	1305 Highway 2 Bypass E. – from intersection of U.S. Highways 83 and 2, go east about 3 miles; DOT is on the east side of Highway 2, just north of gooseneck implement (John Deere dealership)
Underwood	July 13, 2010	337 Old Highway 83 – just north of Underwood on the west side of Highway 83
Ashley	July 14, 2010	520 7th St. S.W. – ½ mile south of Ashley on N.D. Highway 3
Carrington	July 15, 2010	6739 Highway 200 – ½ mile east of junction of N.D. Highway 200 and U.S. Highway 281 on the north side of the road
Valley City	July 16, 2010	1524 8th Ave. S.W. – south of I-94 at exit 292
Adams	July 19, 2010	804 1st Ave. – from the intersection of First Avenue and Park Street, go east one block, on the south side of the road
Cando	July 20, 2010	7411 68th Ave. N.E. – two blocks north of N.D. Highway 17 on east edge of Cando, about one mile east of U.S. Highway 281
Larimore	July 21, 2010	1524 Towner Ave. – north side of Larimore, west side of N.D. Highway 18
Wahpeton	July 22, 2010	7930 180 R Ave. S.E. – ½ mile west of Wahpeton on south side of N.D. Highway 13

NDSU's Crop and Pest Report: A Weekly Newsletter for Farmers and Agricultural Professionals

Each week during the growing season, the NDSU Extension Service holds statewide conference calls with Extension educators and researchers to identify emerging crop and pest management issues. The problems and strategies discussed during these calls then are summarized and published in a weekly newsletter called the "Crop and Pest Report." The first issue for the 2010 growing season is slated for May 13. Fourteen issues are planned for publication. The last issue for the season will be Aug. 19.

The electronic version of the newsletter is available at no charge. A hard-copy version of the newsletter can be obtained for a \$20 subscription. You can subscribe to the newsletter and/or view archived reports dating to 1998 by going to:

www.ag.ndsu.nodak.edu/aginfo/entomology/ndsucpr/index.htm

You also can obtain a subscription by contacting Diane Pennington with the NDSU Department of Entomology at:

NDSU Department of Entomology
NDSU Dept. 7650
P.O. Box 6050
Fargo, ND 58108-6050
Telephone: (701) 231-7582
Fax: (701) 231-8557
diane.pennington@ndsu.edu

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 through 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

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 to preregister at (701) 231-7180 or (701) 231-6388. 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
June 4, 2010	Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. CDT	Statewide via Internet videocast
July 20, 2010	Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. CDT	Statewide via Internet videocast
Aug. 31, 2010	Training 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. CDT	Statewide via Internet videocast

Controlling Bedbugs With DDT: A Historical Perspective

Editor's note: Once again, I am sharing some of my past summer's reading with an extract from a U.S. Public Health Service report from May 1947. The report was titled: "The Techniques of Application and Control of Roaches and Bedbugs with DDT." It was written by Robert L. Stenberg, assistant engineer (R), U.S. Public Health Service.

What is astounding about the results of this study is just how devastating DDT was on bedbug populations. Until the introduction of DDT, bedbugs had been sleeping with man since antiquity, and in just a few short years, they practically were eradicated from the developed world for nearly 50 years. Today, bedbugs are making a dramatic comeback. You can get the latest rundown on bedbugs from an Environmental Protection Agency-sponsored publication, "What's Working for Bed Bug Control in Multifamily Housing: Reconciling best practices with research and the realities of implementation". Go to:

www.healthyhomestraining.org/ipm/NCHH_Bed_Bug_Control_2-12-10.pdf

Introduction

Eradication of bedbug infestations has been difficult in the past because some bedbugs would leave beds and furniture to hide in the cracks of walls and floors, where they were not affected by the petroleum insecticides sprayed on the beds, mattresses, furniture and wall surfaces. DDT (Dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane) overcomes this difficulty because of its lasting toxicity, and many studies already conducted have shown that DDT is the most effective insecticide yet used against bedbugs.

In this study, the extent and type of treatment was varied, different solvents were used, and various concentrations of DDT were applied in an effort to determine the importance of these factors in bedbug

control when DDT is used under practical conditions, i.e., by the householder.

Observations also were made on the advantages or disadvantages in the use of various types of sprayers and nozzles. All spray applications were made in dwellings in which bedbug counts had been made on mattresses, beds and furniture prior to spraying. After spraying, inspections were made once each week for 16 weeks.

Procedure

Premises were divided into groups, according to the extent of the DDT treatment applied in each house, as follows:

1. Mattresses were sprayed on both sides and around the edges. No other spraying was done in houses of this group.
2. Mattresses and bedsprings were sprayed.
3. Mattresses, bedsprings and bedsteads were sprayed. Treatment of bedsteads consisted of spraying chiefly into cracks on the inside of sideboards, as well as into the joints where sideboards fasten to bed ends.
4. Entire beds, including mattresses, bedsprings and bedsteads, were sprayed, as were the walls of the bedroom.
5. Walls and ceilings of the entire house were sprayed, together with all chairs, divans and beds.

Sprayers and nozzles

In the treatment of beds and mattresses, the 1-quart-capacity "Sure Shot Milwaukee" sprayer was tried, but the majority of spraying was done with the 4-gallon-capacity knapsack type of compressed-air sprayer. Use of the "Sure Shot" sprayer resulted in very little waste of spray, but considerable time was

consumed in making the applications. The knapsack-type sprayer, equipped with an atomizing nozzle, producing a flat-fan spray pattern of approximately 50 degrees and having a discharge rate of one-tenth gallon per minute at 40 pounds of pressure, appeared to be the most suitable for quick and thorough treatment of beds. With this nozzle, most surfaces could be given an even application of spray without getting them too wet and without excessive waste. Nozzles of the same type, having wider spray angles and higher discharge rates, left surfaces too wet and were found to result in excessive waste of spray.

Results of bedbug control

Actual counts of bedbugs made in all premises during this 16-week study are summarized in Table 3. (*Table 3 is not reproduced in the Pesticide Quarterly for the sake of brevity.*) No bedbug reinfestations occurred during this period, although many of the places treated were immediately adjacent to infested houses in multiple-unit dwellings. In the case of test No. 2-3 (Table 3), two treated beds repeatedly showed no bedbugs, whereas inspections of a third untreated bed in the same house showed between 25 and 50 bedbugs each week during the study.

Summary

DDT toxicity to bedbugs was investigated by treating groups of infested houses with various DDT sprays, using different solvents and in concentrations ranging from 2.5 to 35 percent DDT.

Extent of DDT treatment ranged from spraying only the mattress in the first group of houses to spraying the entire house and furniture in the fifth group. All methods of treatment used resulted in complete control of bedbugs for the duration of the study.

CropLife America Files Request to Intervene in Polar Bear Lawsuit

Editor's Note: What follows is a news release from CropLife America, a pesticide industry trade association.

CropLife America (CLA) has requested to intervene in the Center for Biological Diversity's lawsuit brought against the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which alleges that the agency has violated the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The lawsuit filed by the activist group is seeking to pre-emptively invalidate registrations for pesticides that it claims jeopardize the polar bear.

"We fully support EPA fulfilling its statutory responsibilities under ESA," said Jay Vroom, president and CEO of CLA. "However, a rescinding or suspending product use restriction with no evidence of actual harm to polar bears would eliminate key protections put in place under FIFRA for pesticide registrants. This lawsuit overlooks the voluminous scientific data, analysis and legal safety criteria required for registration by EPA which show these valuable and necessary crop protection products to be safe for use."

The EPA evaluates potential risks to threatened and endangered species from pesticides as part of its registration review program. As required by the ESA, the agency also consults with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in the registration and approval of chemical products that may affect listed species or their habitats to ensure the products cause "no unreasonable adverse effects on the environment." In its July 2009 notice of intent to file suit, the center argued that any impact from crop protection products must be reduced or "eliminated entirely," or their

use be restricted or suspended to protect polar bears.

"EPA's rigorous scientific reviews of our members' products, as well as their continued review on a regular basis, help assure that all crop protection products meet current scientific and regulatory standards,"

said Doug Nelson, executive vice president and general counsel of CLA. "But imposing restrictions without formal consultations prior to EPA effects determinations and with no finding of legal liability would ignore FIFRA and result in an uncertain registration process for those who must rely on it."

Polar Bears Poisoned by Pesticide Pollution: Lawsuit Filed Against EPA to Protect Arctic From Pesticide Contamination

Editor's note: The following is a news release from a Seattle, Wash.-based environmental activist group. It announced a lawsuit against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency charging failure to adequately protect polar bears from pesticide poisoning.

Dec. 3, 2009 -Today the Center for Biological Diversity filed suit in Seattle against the Environmental Protection Agency for failing to consider impacts to the polar bear and its Arctic habitat from toxic contamination caused by pesticide use in the United States. The EPA did not respond to the center's notification of intent to sue for these failures, sent in June of this year.

Pesticides approved by EPA for use in the United States are known to be transported long distance via various atmospheric, oceanic and biotic pathways to the Arctic. Such pesticides are biomagnified with each step higher in the food web, reaching some of their greatest concentrations in polar bears, the apex predators of the Arctic.

Pesticides and related contaminants have been linked to suppressed immune function, endocrine disruption, shrinkage of reproductive organs, hermaphroditism and increased cub mortality in polar bears. Human subsistence hunters in the Arctic, who share the top spot on the food web with the polar bear, also face increased risks from exposure to these contaminants.

"The pesticide crisis is a silent killer that threatens not only the polar bear but the entire Arctic ecosystem and its communities," said Rebecca Noblin, a staff attorney with the Center for Biological Diversity in Anchorage. "The benefits of protecting the polar bear from pesticide poisoning will reverberate throughout the entire Arctic ecosystem, with positive impacts for Arctic people, who share the top of the food pyramid with polar bears."

continued

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. Include exactly what is requested for use and how it will be used.

All pesticides in the United States must be registered by the EPA before they can be lawfully used. Courts have held that the agency must examine the impacts of any pesticide it approves on federally protected endangered species. The polar bear was formally listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act on May 15, 2008, following a petition and litigation by the Center for Biological Diversity, but the EPA has yet to examine the impacts of any approved pesticide on the species.

"The United States has lagged far behind the international community in taking action to protect the species and people of the Arctic from pesticides and other contaminants,"

said Noblin. "But the listing of the polar bear under the Endangered Species Act gives the EPA both the opportunity and the obligation to meaningfully address the poisoning of the Arctic."

In addition to pesticide contamination and loss of their sea-ice habitat from global warming, polar bears face threats from increased oil and gas development in their habitat and the proliferation of shipping routes in an increasingly ice-free Arctic. These activities bring heightened risk of oil spills and rising levels of noise pollution and other kinds of human disturbance.

While today's action marks the first legal challenge to pesticide registrations due to their impacts on the Arctic, the center has brought several successful lawsuits against the EPA over the impacts of pesticides in the lower 48 states. In 2003, the center filed suit over use of pesticides in the habitat of an imperiled salamander in Texas; in 2006, the center reached a settlement with the agency over the use of 66 pesticides in the habitat of an imperiled amphibian in California; and this summer, as a result of a settlement of another center lawsuit, the EPA proposed restrictions on 74 pesticides due to their impacts on 11 threatened and endangered species in California.