

FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL® UNITED STATES

The mark of responsible forestry FSC® F000232

Environmental and Social Risk Assessment: National Guidance for the United States

Appendix 1: National Guidance ESRA for Glyphosate

Version 1.1

FSC-US

2020



Appendix 1: National Guidance ESRA for Glyphosate

A Note About Formulations

The FSC Pesticides Policy lists glyphosate and it salts as a restricted, highly hazardous pesticide. Identification of risk in the following environmental and social risk assessment for glyphosate and its salts is primarily based on risk assessments produced by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the US Forest Service (USFS). Information regarding formulations from the USFS risk assessment for glyphosate is paraphrased, below¹. As identification of risk was derived from the EPA and USFS risk assessments, this ESRA utilizes the same approach regarding treatment of formulations and surfactants¹:

The USFS considered 52 formulations of glyphosate in its risk assessment (Table 1). When considering formulations, distinct surfactants are more important to the risk assessment than glyphosate's various salts. Additionally, expanded inert statements on product labels is encouraged but not required, and, for the most part, product labels for glyphosate do not clearly designate the use of surfactants.

Use of surfactants are a major issue in the USFS risk assessment for glyphosate, as they may enhance the toxicity of glyphosate but are difficult to account for. For instance, the identify of surfactants is required to be disclosed to the EPA as part of the registration process, but this information is not disclosed publicly, because it is classified as trade secret in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Surfactants are also added to glyphosate formulations prior to application, further complicating the ability to account for them in this risk assessment.

Acknowledging the ambiguities that are characteristic of glyphosate formulations, the USFS risk assessment indicates that "*This document only assesses a surfactant when it is included as part of the formulated product; it does not assess a surfactant that may be included in the tank mix*". Additionally, some commercial formulations of glyphosate contain other pesticides, and some pesticide labels indicate other pesticides which may be used with glyphosate. The USFS risk assessment indicates that "*As with the previous Forest Service risk assessments (SERA 1996, 2003) and the glyphosate risk assessments conducted by the U.S. EPA/OPP (1996a, 2008a), the current Forest Service risk assessment does not consider formulations with multiple active ingredients*".

Table 1. Glyphosate Formulations Identified by the US Forest Service Risk Assessment1

| Formulation Name | Supplier | EPA Reg. No. | Form | Salt | % a.i. | Surfac- tant | Other |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Accord | Monsanto | 524-326 | L | IPA | 41.5% | | Aq |
| Accord Concentrate | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-324 | 62719-324 L IPA 53.8% | | | | |
| Accord SP | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-322 | L | IPA | 41% | Х | No longer available |
| Accord XRT | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-517 | L | IPA | 53.6% | X-POEA ^[10] | |
| Accord XRT II | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-556 | L | DMA | 50.2% | Inferred | |
| Aqua Star | Albaugh, Inc. | 42750-59 | L | IPA | 53.8% | ? ^[7] | |
| AquaMaster (a.k.a. Export and Rodeo) | Monsanto | 524-343 | L | IPA | 53.8% | | Aq |
| AquaNeat | Riverdale | 228-365 | L | IPA | 53.8% | | Aq |
| Buccaneer | Tenkoz Inc | 55467-10 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Х | |
| Buccaneer Plus | Tenkoz Inc | 55467-9 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Х | |
| Cornerstone | Winfield Solutions Agrisolutions | 1381-191 71368-20-1381 | L | IPA | 41.0% | X | |
| Cornerstone Plus | Winfield Solutions | 1381-192 | L | IPA | 41.0% | ? | |
| Credit Extra | Nufarm | 71368-65 | L | Am K | 17.86% 16.26% | X POEA? | |
| Credit Systemic Extra | Nufarm | 71368-20 | L | IPA | 41.0% | X POEA? | |
| Diamondback | EZ-Ject | 83220-1 | Sh | IPA | 83.5% | | Injection |
| DuraMax | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-556 | L | DMA | 50.2% | Inferred | |
| Durango (GF-1279) | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-517 | L | IPA | 53.6% | X-POEA ^[10] | |
| Durango DMA (GF- 1280) | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-556 | L | DMA | 50.2% | Inferred | |
| Eliminator [4,6] | Gro Tec, Inc | 71995-27 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Х | |
| Foresters' Non | Discondata | 220 201 | т | ID A | 52.90/ | Namer | |
| Selective | Riverdale | 228-381 | | IPA | 55.8% | INONE[8] | |
| Glyphogan Clyphomey 41 Dlug (4) | Maknteshim Agan | 62710 222 | L | IPA IDA | 41.0% | Informad | |
| Clyphomax 41 Flus [4] | DowAgio Sciences | 62710 517 | | | 41.0% | | |
| Gly Stor Plus | Albaugh Inc | 42750.61 | | | 41.0% | A-PUEA V | |
| | Albaugh life | 42750-01 | L | пл | 41.070 | Λ | Cancelled |
| Glyphosate VMF | DuPont | 352-609 | L | IPA | 53.8% | | ? |
| Glyphosate 41 Plus | CropSmart | 42750-61-72693 | L | IPA | 41.0% | ? | |
| GlyphoMate 41 or Pronto | PBI/Gordon Corporation | 2217-847 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Х | |
| Glyfos Aquatic | Cheminova A/S | 4787-34 | L | IPA | 53.8% | | Aq |
| Glyfos X-TRA | Cheminova A/S | 4787-23 | L | IPA | 41.0% | X 15%[6] | - |
| Glypro | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-324 | L | IPA | 53.8% | | |
| Gly-4 Plus | Universal Crop Protection Alliance | 72693-1 | L | IPA | 41.0% | X | |
| Helosate Plus | Helm Agro US, Inc | 74530-4 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Inferred | |
| Hi-yield Killzall | Voluntary Purchasing Groups Inc | 67760-49- 7401 | | IPA | 53.8% | | Aq |
| Honcho (a.k.a. Roundup Original) | Monsanto | 524-445 | L | IPA | 41.0% | х | |
| Honcho Plus | Monsanto | 524-454 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Х | |
| Imitator Plus | Drexel Chemical | 19713-526 | L | IPA | 41.0% | ? | |

| Table 2: Glyphosate Formulation | s Identified by the Forest Service |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|

| Formulation Name | Supplier | EPA Reg. No. | Form | Salt | % a.i. | Surfac- tant | Other |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------|------|--------|---------------------|-------|
| KGro Grass and Weed | Swiss Farms | 71995-27- | | | | | |
| Killer ^[5] | Products Inc, | 73327 | L | IPA | 1.92% | | |
| Mirage | Loveland Products | 34704-866 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Inferred | |
| Ranger Pro | Monsanto | 524-517 | L | IPA | 41.0% | Х | |
| RapidFire | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-556 | L | DMA | 50.2% | Inferred | |
| Rattler | Monsanto | 524-445-ZE- 5905 | L | IPA | 41.0% | | |
| Razor | Nufarm | 228-366 [1] | L | IPA | 41.0% | X 8% ^[8] | |
| Razor Pro | Nufarm | 228-366 [1] | L | IPA | 41.0% | X 14%[8] | |
| Rodeo | DowAgro Sciences | 62719-324 | L | IPA | 53.8% | | |
| Roundup Original Max | Monsanto | 524-539 [3] | L | K | 48.7% | Х | |
| Roundup Pro | Monsanto | 524-475 [2] | L | IPA | 41.0% | X 14.5% | |
| Roundup Pro Concentrate | Monsanto | 524-539 [3] | L | IPA | 50.2% | X 13% | |
| Roundup ProDry | Monsanto | 524-505 | G | Am | 71.4% | Х | |
| Roundup ProMax | Monsanto | 524-579 | L | K | 48.7% | Х | |
| Roundup UltraMax | Monsanto | 524-512 | L | IPA | 50.2% | Х | |
| Roundup UltraDry | Monsanto | 524-504 | G | Am | 71.4% | X 25% | |
| Roundup WeatherMax | Monsanto | 524-537 | L | K | 48.8% | X | |
| RT 3 | Monsanto | 524-544 | L | K | 48.8% | X | |

^[1]Razor and Razor Pro appear to have the same EPA Registration number but the formulations are different.

^[2] Based on the EPA master product label, this registration number applies to the following brand names: Roundup Ultra Herbicide; Roundup Ultra RT Herbicide; Roundup Pro Herbicide; Roundup Original II CA;

MON 77360 Herbicide; Roundup W Herbicide; Gly 41 Herbicide.

^[3] Based on the Product Labels and MSDSs, Roundup Original Max and Roundup Pro Concentrate have the same EPA registration number but contain different salts of glyphosate.

^[4] Need specimen label. The EPA labels are not clear (are ambiguous) in terms of the formulation(s) covered.

^[5] MSDS cannot be located, including searches of <u>http://www.msdsonline.com</u> and <u>http://www.cdms.net</u>. ^[6] From Lajmanovich et al. 2003 but not specifically identified as Glyphos Plus.

^[7] Bringolf et al. (2007) state that Aqua Star does not contain the MON 0808 POEA surfactant. It is

not clear whether or not this formulation contains a less toxic surfactant.

^[8] Information confirmed by Nufarm (Ehresman 2010a).

^[9] Dow (Fonseca 2010a) has indicated that Accord SP (EPA Reg. No. 62719-322) is not longer commercialized.

^[10] Based on information provided by Dow AgroSciences (Fonseca 2010a)

Key:

Form: L=Liquid; G=Granular; Sh=Shells

Salt: Am=Ammonium salt: DMA=Dimethylamine salt;

IPA=Isopropylamine salt; K=Potassium salt;

Other: Aq=Aquatic application; Inj=Injection.

Formulations containing herbicides other than glyphosate as the a.e. are not included.

Environmental National Assessment

| Pesticide: | Glyphosate | | Specific Formulation: |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| Hazard Status: | ard us: Glyphosate is a restricted, highly hazardous pesticide (HHP) based on its classification in the Chronic Toxicity hazard group and demonstration of the potential for carcinogenic properties (Criterion 3) per the FSC Pesticides Policy (FSC-POL-30-001 V3-0 EN) and the FSC Lists of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (FSC-POL-30-001a EN). However, risks from other FSC hazard groups and toxicity categories were not precluded from this assessment. | | DISCLAIMER: Adoption or adaption of this national-level assessment alone does not guarantee compliance with FSC-POL-30-001 V3-0 (see Background/Expectations Section) |
| Exposure Elements | Minimum list of values | Description of why/why not a risk | National-level Mitigation strategies defined to minimize risk1 |
| Environmental | Soil (erosion, degradation, biota, carbon storage) | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Soil was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. Additional considerations are provided, below. There is potential for soil erosion due to vegetation changes and effects on soil microorganisms. There is minimal indication of adverse effect to terrestrial microorganisms (1): Most studies find minimal effect on soil microorganisms based on field trials, but some contradictory studies find an effect when tests are performed in the lab (1). Effects on terrestrial vegetation may cause changes in microbial populations (1). Changes to terrestrial vegetation may also cause erosion of soil (1). | Follow all pesticide label application instructions. Follow applicable criterion and indicators from the FSC US FM Standard V1.0 (e.g., Criterion 4.3 for worker safety, Criterion 7.3 for worker training, Criterion 6.5 for protecting water resources, and Criteria 8.1 and 8.2 for Monitoring). Additional risk mitigation strategies are provided below. Organizations should take reasonable steps toward avoiding environmental and social impacts by considering the mitigation strategies provided below, as well as application-, Organization-, or location- specific strategies. General consideration of exposure variables designed to mitigate risk: |
| | Water (ground water, surface waters, water supplies) | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Water was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. Additional considerations are provided, below. All formulations may pose risk to sensitive aquatic plant species, while tolerant species should not be adversely affected by non-accidental exposures (1). Due to its herbicidal properties there is potential for secondary effects caused by spray drift to increase risks to non-target aquatic plants (2). | -Know and understand the specific pesticide formulation and/or tank mixture, as its unique formulation may provide a different risk characterization. -Understand how the mixture of active ingredients affects the pesticides risk profile. -Seek to minimize the frequency, interval, and amount of application. -use the most efficient and effective method of application by seeking to minimize risk to environmental and social values. -Understand the site (e.g., soil type, topography, etc.) and climatic (e.g., wind, temperature, and |

| | | Some formulations are more toxic to aquatic | humidity) conditions and the likely effect on risk to |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | organisms due to the presence of an added | environmental and social values. |
| | | surfactant, Rodeo, for example, has no surfactant | -Have appropriate waste management systems in |
| | | added because it's intended for use in water to treat | place. |
| | | aquatic weeds (1) | |
| | | | Mitigating Risk to the Environment: reduce |
| | | There is potential for contamination of water used for | contact with water resources and minimize |
| | | irrigation (1) However risk of contaminated surface | application amounts and number of applications |
| | | water for drinking water resources is low (1) | application amounts and number of applications. |
| | | Minimal indication of adverse effects to | -Never apply directly to water, or areas where |
| | | Atmosphere was found when glyphosate is used | surface water is present. This includes when you |
| | | according to label instructions in forestry | are cleaning equipment (3) |
| _ | | applications. Additional considerations are | -Reduce applications by considering that when |
| Ita | | provided below | applying to applications by considering that when |
| ler | Atmosphere (air | | been mowed grazed or cut and have not been |
| μ | quality greenhouse | Studies done in South America have shown an | allowed to regrow to the recommended stage for |
| 10 | quality, greenhouse | association between spray formulations mixed with | treatment" reduced control could result (3) |
| <ir></ir> | gasses | surfactants and the potential for genetoxic effects | -Reduce runoff by considering weather patterns |
| E I | | However, the experience concentrations, routes of | as weather events like heavy rainfall could wash |
| - | | avpacure, and exposure patterns are not relevant to | the product off of targeted foliage (3) |
| | | these exposure to exposure patterns are not relevant to | Targeted spray should be uniform and complete |
| | | applications in the US (1, 2) | without reaching the point of runoff (2) |
| | | Applications in the US (1, 2). | Aorial applications should only be made under |
| | | most brodulear plants will be killed of seriously | motoorological conditions that minimize the |
| | | injured by direct exposure to gipphosate, | notontial for spray drift (3) |
| | | annough there is significant range sensitivity | potential for spray unit (5). |
| | | among species (1). Winimal indication of adverse | Mitigating Bick to Public Accoss/Public |
| | | effects to other Non-target species (e.g., | Walfara |
| | | terrestrial microorganisms, mammais, | |
| | | invertebrates, and birds) was round when | Paduas the passibility of public consumption of |
| | New terret energies | gippnosate is used according to label | - Reduce the possibility of public consumption of |
| | Non-target species | Instructions in forestry applications (1). | contaminated wild 1000 (e.g., fruit of fungi) and |
| | (vegetation, wildlife, | Additional considerations are provided, below. | public exposure to pesticides timough public |
| | bees and other | | outreach and engagement, innung access, and/or |
| | pollinators, pets) | Hazard for acute exposure to small mammals | appropriate signage. For instance, users of the |
| | | (rabbits, rats) from consuming contaminated | forest may be excluded from the area using |
| | | vegetation after terrestrial application (1). | barriers or signage until the pesticide dries. |
| | | Additionally, consumption of contaminated insects | Minimizing Disk of Cancer Duitter winter the |
| | | may reach level of concern, especially for more toxic | winimizing Risk of Spray Drift: unintentional |
| | | tormulations (1). Unintentional secondary effects on | spray artit has potential to significantly increase |
| | | vegetation may benefit or adversely affect mammals | risk to the environment and public welfare. |
| | | (1). Changes in vegetation are more likely to affect | |
| | | terrestrial invertebrates than their own exposure to | -Minimize potential for drift by increasing droplet |

Appendices for the Environmental and Social Risk Assessment: National Guidance for the United States (Version 1.1, 2020) - 6 of 12-

| | | alvohosate (1) | size considering weather patterns and |
|--------|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | | considering alternative application methods when |
| | | Potential toxicity for terrestrial animals including | pesticides must be applied adjacent to sensitive |
| | | insects birds and mammals at application rates | ecological areas (e.g. HCVs, etc.) |
| | | avecading common forestry application rates (1) | Controlling droplet size: volume, pressure |
| | | | -Controlling droplet size. volume, pressure, |
| | | Due te alumbasete being e neet emergenee | tune hears leagth (2) |
| | | Due to gryphosate being a post-emergence | type, boom length (3). |
| | | nerdicide, foliar contact with it may pose a risk to | -For ground boom applications: release neight |
| | | terrestrial non-target plants. Offsite drift poses a risk | during application should be no more than 4 feet |
| | | to sensitive species (related to application method, | above the ground or crop canopy (2). |
| | | application rate, site-specifics, etc.) (1). While | -For ground and aerial applications: nozzles and |
| | | terrestrial plants are very sensitive to foliar | pressures should be chosen that deliver "fine" or |
| | | application, they are substantially less sensitive to | coarser droplets. (Indicated in nozzle |
| | | soil exposure (per seedling emergence studies) (1). | manufacturers catalogues; accordance with |
| | | | American Society of Agricultural & Biological |
| | | Precaution is needed with application in close | Engineers Standard 572.1) (2). |
| | | proximity to water, as there is a potential of risk to | -Applicators should not spray during temperature |
| | | amphibians, invertebrates, algae and other aquatic | inversions (2). |
| | | organisms (1). | -For aerial applications: should not be applied |
| | | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Non- | when wind speeds exceed 15 mph, and if this is |
| _ | | timber forest products was found when | the case then the boom length should be adjusted |
| Ita | Non-timbor forost | glyphosate is used according to label | to 65% or "less of the wingspan for fixed wing |
| er | products (as ESC STD | instructions in forestry applications. Additional | aircraft and 75% or less of the rotor blade |
| E | | considerations are provided, below. | diameter for helicopters. Otherwise, the boom |
| JO. | Bringinles and Criteria | | length must be 75% or less of the wingspan for |
| vir | criterion 5 1) | There is minimal indication of adverse effects to | fixed- wing aircraft and 90% or less of the rotor |
| Ĺ L | cinterion 5.1) | terrestrial microorganisms. There is potential for | diameter for helicopters. The release height |
| | | spray drift to expose surrounding fruit and/or | should be no higher than 10 feet from the top of |
| | | vegetation to glyphosate (1). | the crop canopy or ground, unless a greater |
| | | Minimal indication of adverse effects to High | application height is required for pilot safety" (2). |
| | | Conservation Values was found when | |
| | | glyphosate is used according to label | |
| | High Conservation | instructions in forestry applications. Additional | |
| | Values (particularly | considerations are provided, below. | |
| | HCV 1-4) | • • | |
| | | However, unintentional secondary effects on habitat. | |
| | | landscape and ecosystem are possible, primarily | |
| | | due to changes in vegetation (1). | |
| | | Minimal indication of adverse effects to | |
| | Landscape (aesthetics. | Landscape values was found when glyphosate is | |
| | cumulative impacts) | used according to label instructions in forestry | |
| | | applications. Additional considerations are | |
| | | | |

Appendices for the Environmental and Social Risk Assessment: National Guidance for the United States (Version 1.1, 2020) - 7 of 12-

| | provided, below. However, unintentional habitat/ landscape effects are possible, primarily due to changes in vegetation (1). |
|--|--|
| Ecosystem services (water, soil, carbon sequestration, | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Ecosystem services was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. Additional considerations are provided, below. |
| tourism) | However, unintentional habitat/landscape/ecosystem effects are possible, primarily due to changes in vegetation (1). |

1 Mitigation strategies have been categorized to avoid redundancy

Sources

- (1) USDA/Forest Service. (2011). Glyphosate Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Final Report. Prepared by Syracuse Environmental Research Associates, Inc. under USDA Forest Service Contract AG-3187-C-06-0010. Retrieved from https://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/pdfs/Glyphosate_SERA_TR-052-22-03b.pdf.
- (2) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2019, May). Glyphosate Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision Case Number 0178 (Docket Number EPA-HQ-OP-2009-0361). Retrieved from https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0361-14442.
- (3) Dow AgroSciences, LLC. (2015). Safety Data Sheet [Rodeo]. Retrieved from https://www.greenbook.net/corteva-agriscience-dow/rodeo.

Social National Assessment

| Pesticide: | Glyphosate | | Specific Formulation: |
|----------------------|--|---|---|
| Hazard Status: | Glyphosate is a restricted, classification in the Chron potential for carcinogenic (FSC-POL-30-001 V3-0 E (FSC-POL-30-001a EN). I toxicity categories were no | highly hazardous pesticide (HHP) based on its ic Toxicity hazard group and demonstration of the properties (Criterion 3) per the FSC Pesticides Policy N) and the FSC Lists of Highly Hazardous Pesticides However, risks from other FSC hazard groups and ot precluded from this assessment. | DISCLAIMER: Adoption or adaption of this national-level assessment alone does not guarantee compliance with FSC-POL-30-001 V3-0 (see Background/Expectations Section) |
| Exposure Elements | Minimum list of values | Description of why/why not a risk | National-level Mitigation strategies defined to minimize risk1 |
| | High Conservation Values (especially HCV 5-6) | Minimal indication of adverse effects to High Conservation Values was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. | Follow all pesticide label application instructions. Follow applicable criterion and indicators from the FSC US FM Standard V1.0 (e.g., Criterion 4.3 for worker safety, Criterion 7.3 for worker training, Criterion 6.5 for protecting water resources, and Criteria 8.1 and 8.2 for Monitoring). Applicators or |
| | Health (fertility, reproductive health, respiratory health, | Risks to human health for workers is generally considered minimal (1). However, national assessments using the hazard quotient (HQ) methodology, as well as independent reports and research, indicate potential for toxicity in workers and the general public (1) as follows: Studies done in South America have shown an association between spray formulations mixed with surfactants and the potential for genotoxic effects. However, the exposure concentrations, routes of | persons supervising application of restricted use pesticides are required to be certified in accordance with EPA regulations and state, territorial and tribal laws. Additional risk mitigation strategies are provided below. Organizations should take reasonable steps toward avoiding environmental and social impacts by considering the mitigation strategies provided below, as well as application-, Organization-, or location- specific strategies. |
| | neurological and gastrointestinal problems, cancer and hormonal imbalance) | exposure, and exposure patterns are not relevant to those expected to occur during and after forestry applications in the US (1, 2). Systemic effects in workers due to dermal exposures have been reported and are a potential hazard. Such effects are "consistent with signs of gross over-exposure to glyphosate but would not be expected under normal circumstances" (1). While there is minimal to no hazard for the general public for aquatic applications, there is a potential | General consideration of exposure variables designed to mitigate risk: -Know and understand the specific pesticide formulation, as its unique formulation may provide a different risk characterization. -Understand the mixture of active ingredients. -Seek to minimize the frequency, interval, and amount of application. -Use the most efficient and effective method of application by seeking to minimize risk to environmental and social values. |

| | | hazard present for acute exposure in terrestrial application if contaminated vegetation or fruit is consumed (1). There is minimal indication of adverse effects to residential handlers or non- occupational bystanders of glyphosate, this includes adverse effects related to spray drift (2). There is minimal to no hazard to workers identified | -Understand the site (e.g., soil type, topography, etc.) and climatic (e.g., wind, temperature, and humidity) conditions and the likely effect on risk to environmental and social values. -Have appropriate waste management systems in place. Mitigating Risk to Workers: Label instructions |
|--------|--|---|---|
| | | for terrestrial and aquatic applications , assuming label directions are followed (1). | should be followed when applying pesticides. |
| | | Glyphosate formulations with a surfactant may pose greater risk; care should be taken to read and understand the SDS for glyphosate formulation that may contain a surfactant (1). | personal protective equipment (PPE). For instance, use proper attire including long-sleeved shirt and long pants, shoes plus socks, protective eyewear, and gloves (3). |
| Social | Welfare | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Welfare was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. | -Chemically resistant gloves should be worn, especially when exposure will be prolonged or contact is frequently repeated (3). Appropriate glove barrier materials include: "Butyl rubber. Natural rubber ("latex") Neoprene |
| | | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Food and water was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. Additional considerations are provided, below. | Nitrile/butadiene rubber ("nitrile" or "NBR"). Polyethylene. Ethyl vinyl alcohol laminate ("EVAL"). Polyvinyl chloride ("PVC" or "vinyl")" (3). -If clothing has been drenched or heavily saturated with product it must be discarded. |
| | Food and water | Risk of contact with vegetation and/or fruit is possible. Consuming fruit and/or vegetation immediately after application was found to be more hazardous to wildlife (1). | Persons with contaminated clothing should wash thoroughly after discarding, and before putting on clean clothing (3). -Hands should be washed before eating, drinking, chewing gum, using tobacco or using the toilet (3). -Although most conditions do not require |
| | Social Infrastructure; (schools and hospitals, recreational infrastructure, | Minimal indication of adverse effects to Social Infrastructure was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. | respiratory protection, protection should be worn when irritation occurs or if there is potential to exceed the exposure limit requirements or guidelines (3). |
| | infrastructure adjacent to the management unit) | | Mitigating Risk to Public Access/Public Welfare: -Reduce the possibility of public consumption of |
| | Economic viability (agriculture, livestock, tourism) | Glyphosate application presents risk to sensitive nontarget vegetation (1), which may have economic impacts. | contaminated wild food (e.g., fruit or fungi) and public exposure to pesticides through public |

| | | There is a potential for spray drift to cause a risk to sensitive species "at distances of 100 feet for backpack applications, 500 feet for ground broadcast applications, and over 900 feet for aerial applications" (1). Minimal indication of adverse effects to Rights, | outreach and engagement, limiting access, and/or appropriate signage. For instance, users of the forest may be excluded from the area using barriers or signage until the pesticide dries. -Consider effects on local communities and indigenous peoples when considering limiting access to treatment areas. |
|--------|------------------------------|---|---|
| Social | Rights (legal and customary) | accept when access is restricted, was found when glyphosate is used according to label instructions in forestry applications. | Minimizing Risk of Spray Drift: unintentional spray drift has potential to increase risk to the environment and public welfare. -Minimize potential for drift by increasing droplet size, considering weather patterns, and |
| | Others | No additional values were identified in this assessment. | considering alternative application methods when pesticides must be applied near residences, crops, or other public areas. Controlling droplet size includes changes in: Volume, pressure, number of nozzles, nozzle orientation, nozzle type, boom length (3). For ground boom applications: release height during application should be no more than 4 feet above the ground or crop canopy (2). For ground and aerial applications: nozzles and pressures should be chosen that deliver "fine" or coarser droplets. (Indicated in nozzle manufacturers catalogues; accordance with American Society of Agricultural & Biological Engineers Standard 572.1) (2). For aerial applications: should not be applied when wind speeds exceed 15 mph, and if this is the case then the boom length should be adjusted to 65% or "less of the wingspan for fixed wing aircraft and 75% or less of the rotor blade diameter for helicopters. Otherwise, the boom length must be 75% or less of the wingspan for fixed wing aircraft and 90% or less of the rotor diameter for helicopters. The release height should be no higher than 10 feet from the top of |

| the crop canopy or ground, unless a greater application height is required for pilot safety" (2) |
|---|
|---|

1 Mitigation strategies have been categorized to avoid redundancy

Sources

- (1) USDA/Forest Service. (2011). Glyphosate Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Final Report. Prepared by Syracuse Environmental Research Associates, Inc. under USDA Forest Service Contract AG-3187-C-06-0010. Retrieved from <u>https://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/pesticide/pdfs/Glyphosate_SERA_TR-052-22-03b.pdf</u>.
- (2) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2019, May). Glyphosate Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision Case Number 0178 (Docket Number EPA-HQ-OP-2009-0361). Retrieved from https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0361-14442.
- (3) Dow AgroSciences, LLC. (2015). Safety Data Sheet [Rodeo]. Retrieved from https://www.greenbook.net/corteva-agriscience-dow/rodeo.