

## Trump New Rules for Assessing Pesticide Risks Ignore Many Harms to Endangered Species

By <u>Center For Biological Diversity</u> Global Research, March 16, 2020 <u>Center for Biological Diversity</u> 12 March 2020 Region: <u>USA</u> Theme: <u>Environment</u>, <u>Law and Justice</u>

The Environmental Protection Agency today <u>issued</u> revised methods for assessing pesticide risks that will allow widespread harm to most of the nation's most endangered plants and animals, including American burying beetles, Rio Grande silvery minnows and Hawaiian hoary bats.

The revised methods from the Trump administration, requested by the pesticide industry, overlook and ignore many of the common ways that protected species are harmed and killed by pesticides. For example, they fail to take into account downstream impacts of pesticides that runoff into streams and rivers or the loss of insect pollinators that endangered plants depend upon.

"This disgraceful new rule prioritizes the pesticide industry's profits over the protection of America's most endangered animals and plants," said Lori Ann Burd, environmental health director at the Center for Biological Diversity. "It's painfully clear that pesticides have a devastating effect on some of our most vulnerable species, and the Trump administration is intent on thwarting urgently needed protections."

Using the revised methods, the EPA released new assessments finding that the highly toxic pesticide <u>carbaryl</u> is likely to harm 1,542 protected species, or 86% of all endangered plants and animals. It found that the pesticide <u>methomyl</u> is likely to harm 1,114 of all protected species, or 62%. Species adversely affected include the highly endangered whooping crane, San Joaquin kit fox and all species of salmon.

Carbaryl and methomyl are neurotoxic insecticides in the carbamate class, very similar to organophosphates such as chlorpyrifos. They are highly toxic and among the worst pesticides still in use.

The EPA walked back some of the worst ideas from its draft revised methods, which were <u>described</u> by the attorneys general of 10 states and the District of Columbia as "antithetical to the plain language and purpose of the ESA."

"The EPA recognized that the draft revised methods were so blatantly propesticide that they had to dial them back. Even so, they still fail to meet the Endangered Species Act's requirements for determining harm to protected plants and animals," said Burd. "We're in the midst of a heartbreaking wildlife extinction crisis, and the EPA's new rules only make the situation worse." Today's assessments of carbaryl and methomyl were the result of extensive litigation and the EPA reaching a legal <u>settlement</u> with the Center in which it committed to assess the risks that eight of the nation's most harmful pesticides pose to protected plants and animals. To date the EPA has never once implemented a nationwide Endangered Species Act consultation on pesticides, as required under the Act.

The revised methods released today are designed to allow pesticides to remain on the market without common-sense restrictions on their use to protect endangered species. They disregard the <u>recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences</u> and ignore the mandate of the Endangered Species Act to give imperiled wildlife and plants the benefit of the doubt when evaluating the range of impacts caused by exposure to pesticides.

Records obtained through the Freedom of Information Act show that the new assessment methods were driven by political-level appointees at the EPA, Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce and the White House.

From 2013 to 2017 career scientists at the EPA and federal wildlife agencies worked to implement the recommendations of the National Academy of Science assessing the impacts of pesticides. This collaborative and transparent process was developed with hundreds of hours of stakeholder input but was halted when then acting Interior Secretary David Bernhardt was briefed on the results of the initial assessments in October 2017.

This <u>unprecedented effort</u> to scuttle endangered species consultations spurred the EPA and wildlife agencies to attempt to justify their failure to release the analysis and to demonstrate they are taking action to save endangered animals on the brink of extinction.

\*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Featured image: San Joaquin kit fox, courtesy of USFWS

The original source of this article is <u>Center for Biological Diversity</u> Copyright © <u>Center For Biological Diversity</u>, <u>Center for Biological Diversity</u>, 2020

## **Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**

## **Become a Member of Global Research**

Articles by: Center For Biological Diversity

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: <a href="mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca">publications@globalresearch.ca</a>

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca