APPENDIX 1-7. Determination of Overlap of Likely Glyphosate Exposure Area and Species Ranges and Critical Habitat for Species Located in the 48 Contiguous United States (ConUS)

The overlap extent of glyphosate’s likely exposure areas and the range (or critical habitat) of a species integrates information on potential use sites and usage data. This approach considers overlap of the species range (or critical habitat) with acres treated with glyphosate in a state, according to available usage data, and those acres receiving spray drift from the reported treatments. To address uncertainties associated with how treated acres may be distributed within a state (relative to a species range or critical habitat), and the magnitude of usage on any given year, approaches are employed to represent a central estimate of overlap as well as upper and lower bounds. These different estimates are considered in the Weight of Evidence when deciding whether use of glyphosate is likely or not likely to adversely affect (LAA or NLAA) an individual of an assessed species. The estimated overlap extent of the likely exposure area and species range (or critical habitat) is used in Step 2 as a surrogate for the percent of the listed population that could be exposed to glyphosate. Additional details are provided in the Revised Method[[1]](#footnote-2) document. This appendix describes the approach for determining the extent of overlap.

1. Potential Use Sites

Glyphosate’s registered uses include both agricultural and non-agricultural sites. Potential agricultural use sites of glyphosate are represented by 15 Use Data Layers (UDLs) generated by aggregating crops originally represented by USDA’s Crop Data Layer (CDL). This process for developing theses agricultural UDLs are described in detail in **APPENDIX 1-5 and APPENDIX 1-6**. The glyphosate specific agricultural UDLs include several individual crops, including:

1. Corn
2. Cotton
3. Soybeans
4. Wheat
5. Pasture
6. Rice
7. Bermuda grass

Potential agricultural use sites for glyphosate also include several UDLs that represent aggregated crops; for additional detail see **APPENDIX 1-5**:

1. Citrus
2. Fallow
3. Grapes
4. Other crops
5. Other grains
6. Other orchards
7. Other row crops
8. Vegetables and ground fruit

Potential non-agricultural use sites of glyphosate are represented by 9 UDLs. The data sources used to generate these UDLs were use specific, for additional details see **APPENDIX 1-6**. The glyphosate specific non-agricultural UDLs include:

1. Aquatic Herbicide
2. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)
3. Christmas Trees
4. Developed
5. Forest Trees
6. Noncultivated
7. Nurseries
8. Open Space Developed
9. Right of way

In total 24 UDLs represent the agricultural and non-agricultural uses for glyphosate. To incorporate usage, an aggregated percent crop treated (PCT) is generated for each of the UDLs. The crosswalk in **ATTACHMENT 1-4** is used to link the usage information provided by the EPA’s Science Information & Analysis Branch (SIAB) in their SIAB Use and Usage Matrix (SUUM) with additional data from the Census of Agriculture (CoA) for the unsurveyed, unreported, or unregistered crops needed when calculating the aggregated PCTs for agricultural uses on a state/crop basis. For crop uses, **APPENDIX 1-6** uses the chemical independent information provided in the crosswalk **(ATTACHMENT 1-4)** to provide a glyphosate specific crosswalk across crop data sources (SUUM, CoA, and UDL) for the glyphosate uses. Aggregated PCTs for non-agricultural UDLs are generated based on the information provided in the SUUM, additional details are provided in the following section.

Because the pesticide usage data available are based on surveys of growers and/or other user groups, all reported PCTs below 2.5% are rounded up to 2.5%, to buffer against uncertainty associate with these surveys and low usage estimates. The surveys utilized by EPA are designed to be statistically robust, but by definition sample the target populations rather than provide a complete accounting of all pesticide usage. Therefore, PCT estimates resulting in values below 2.5% are generally a good indicator of limited usage of an active ingredient but by using 2.5% the PCT accounts for possible usage not captured by the survey data.

1. Applying Usage Data to UDLs

Annual total agricultural usage for glyphosate between 2014 and 2018 averaged approximately 280 million pounds whereas the average total treated acreage was 285 million. During this time frame, the crops with the most usage in terms of annual average total pounds of acid equivalent of glyphosate applied nationally were soybeans (114 million lbs), corn (90 million lbs), and cotton (20 million lbs). The crops with the most usage in terms of total treated acreage was were the same with 114, 93 and 19 million acres treated for soybeans, corn and cotton, respectively. **(APPENDIX 1-4**).

Over 21 million pounds of glyphosate are applied to non-agricultural sites annually. Most recent non-agricultural usage data from years 2013 or 2016, depending on the use site, (see **APPENDIX 1-4** for details) shows that the largest use in terms of average annual pounds applied is consumer application to outdoor premises of household/domestic dwellings (5 million pounds a.e.), followed by application to roadways (4.7 million pounds a.e.) and forestry sites (4.2 million pounds a.e.)**.**

Other use sites with greater than 1 million pounds include nursery and greenhouse ornamentals, institutional turf facilities, and application by lawn care operators. Use site with less than a million pounds include railways, utility/pipeline ROWs, sod farms, application by landscape contractors, direct applications to water and golf courses.

* 1. Agricultural Uses

The goal of this approach is to determine the amount of area within each state that is treated with glyphosate (referred to as “treated acres”). This is accomplished by combining data representing the potential use sites, including the UDLs and acres grown from the 2012 Census of Agriculture with available usage data. For the agricultural UDLs, multiple years of data are included to capture temporal changes such as crop rotations. The current years of the CDL included in the UDLs are 2013-2017.

For glyphosate’s agricultural crop uses, usage data are available to quantify the percent of crop area that has been treated (PCT) for surveyed crops within surveyed states. The PCT can be used to adjust the extent of the potential use overlapping with a listed species’ range or critical habitat representing the more likely extent of overlap that is directly treated with glyphosate. PCT data are available for specific crops and states. Glyphosate usage data are summarized in the Science Information and Analysis Branch (SIAB) Use and Usage Matrix (SUUM; **APPENDIX 1-4**). The glyphosate SUUM reports PCT data based on agricultural usage for a window of 5 years depending the source and generally a single year for non-agricultural usage; see **APPENDIX 1-4** for the specific years. Three statistics for PCT are reported for each state-crop combination (where crops are surveyed): average, minimum and maximum annual PCT. The method discussed below is applied separately to the average, minimum and maximum annual PCT data in order to quantify the overlap of species range and exposure areas, while accounting for variability in usage over time. A flow chat describing the process to incorporate usage data to the spatial results is provided in Figure 1.

The flow chart below (Figure 1) diagrams the process for generating the data used to apply the usage method. Each dashed box is an individual workflow or tool. Blue boxes represent original data, green boxes processed data, orange boxes highlight specific steps from a tool and yellow boxes represent a review process. Tools published with the BE are highlighted with letters in the title spatial tools have yellow backgrounds, tools that generated tabular inputs have peach backgrounds and non-automated workflows are indicated with a gray background.




Figure 1. Flow chart of the usage application to the UDLs and species co-occurrence results.

Usage data are applied to the 15 agricultural UDLs discussed above. Crops reported in the SUUM are associated with the categories used for the UDLs using the crosswalk in **APPENDIX 1-6**. For categories represented by a single crop in both the SUUMs and landcover UDLs (*e.g.,* corn, soybean), the available PCT data for a given state are applied directly to the acres of the UDL in that state to calculate the acres treated (acres treated = acres grown x PCT). If the PCT is not available for a specific state/crop combination, because it is not surveyed, a surrogate PCT is applied using the process described in the next section.

For those categories representing multiple crops in either the SUUMs or landcover UDLs (*e.g.,* vegetables and ground fruit), an aggregated PCT is calculated. In order to calculate the aggregated PCT, the acres grown and PCT for each crop in the category are needed by state. Both pieces of information are found in the SUUM for each state/crop combination with reported usage. Acreage in the SUUM can come from a variety of sources, including, but not limited to, market research data, USDA’s National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), and California’s Pesticide Use Reporting (PUR). While all these sources provide slightly different results, they are all similar to, and based upon, the acreage developed by NASS’ CoA. If the state/crop combination does not have reported usage, because it was not surveyed, the information in the SUUM is supplemented with data from the 2012[[2]](#footnote-3) Census of Agriculture (USDA-NASS, 2012, see **ATTACHMENT 1-3** for details on tabulating the Census of Agriculture). The Census of Agriculture is also used to account for crops in the UDL that are not registered. In this situation, information is not provided for these crops in the SUUM, but the crops would be included in the UDL as zero PCT. The crosswalk in **ATTACHMENT 1-4** is used to supplement the SUUM information with the additional data needed from the Census of Agriculture for calculating the aggregated PCTs on a state/crop basis. **APPENDIX 1-6** uses the chemical independent information provided in **ATTACHMENT 1-4** to provide a glyphosate specific crosswalk across crop data sources for glyphosate uses. This process results in three scenarios:

* The Census of Agriculture crop/state combination is found in the SUUM, and the acres grown and crop specific PCT from the SUUM are used directly.
* The Census of Agriculture crop is registered but there is no state specific usage information reported in the SUUM, because the crop was not surveyed. In this scenario the acres grown for the state are extracted from the Census of Agriculture and a surrogate for the crop specific PCT is assigned using the method described in the next section.
* The Census of Agriculture crop is not a registered use. In this scenario, the acres grown for the state are extracted from Census of Agriculture and a PCT of 0 is used in the calculation of the aggregated PCT. This is done to account for crops found in the UDL that are not registered for the active ingredient(s) assessed.

At the end of this process all state/crop combinations found in the Census of Agriculture are accounted for, with acres grown and a crop specific PCT. The aggregated PCT for a state is generated by first calculating the base acres treated for each crop by dividing the PCT (or surrogate PCT) by the crop acres grown, summing these treated acres for all crops in the UDL category. This value is then dividing by the total acres grown for all crops in the UDL. For state/crops combinations with usage data, the acres grown are extracted from the SUUM; for state/crops combination without usage the acres grown are extracted from the Census of Agriculture; see **ATTACHMENT 1-3** for details on tabulating the Census of Agriculture. **Equation 1** isused to generate the aggregated PCTs.

**Equation 1**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i = | crop (within land cover class j) that is surveyed in state |
| j = | land cover class (e.g., vegetables and ground fruit) |
| n = | number of crops (within land cover class j) with acres grown in state |
| PCTi = | percent crop treated of crop i (from SUUM) |
| PCTtot-j = | aggregated PCT (for land cover class j in state) |
| Gi = | acres of crop i grown (in state) (from SUUM) |

Acres treated for UDLs with multiple crops are calculated by multiplying this aggregated PCT by the area of the UDL for the state. The total area of the UDL for the state only includes those counties with at least 1 registered use as reported in the Census of Agriculture. If the Census of Agriculture reports all registered crops in a given UDL as not grown in a county, the county is excluded from the totals prior to calculating the treated acres.

One conservative assumption of this approach is that it does not account for multiple applications to the same fields. Usage data represents the potential acres where at least one glyphosate application occurred. The data do not identify sites where multiple applications occur within the same year. The approach used here assumes that all treated acres are independent. Therefore, if the available usage data represent sites where multiple applications occurred (which is permitted on glyphosate labels), each acre is only counted one time. The aggregated UDLs will, however, overestimate the treated acres in a given year due to the conservative nature of the aggregation, especially when the total area in the UDL exceeds what is reported in the Census of Agriculture.

* 1. Non-Agricultural Uses

Non-agricultural national level usage data for the contiguous United States (ConUS) are available in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4;** see Table 3 in the SUUM**).** The usage information can be available as treated area based on survey data or reported as average pound applied for the use.Similar to the agricultural uses, if a single UDL represents multiple use sites found in the SUUM these usage data are aggregated into aggregated PCTs.

If information on treatable acres, base acres treated for all herbicides and/or treated acres for glyphosate is available from the market research survey data this information is used in the calculation of the non-agricultural PCTs. Treated acres specific to glyphosate usage are available for many non-agricultural use sites and this information is used in the calculation of non-agricultural maximum PCT. The maximum PCT is based on the ratio of acres treated with glyphosate to the total treatable acres for the non-agricultural use (**Equation 2)**.

**Equation 2**

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Acres treated gly = | Acreage that is treated with glyphosate |
| Total Treatable Acres = | land cover class (e.g., vegetables and ground fruit) |
| PCT avg = | Calculated average PCT |

When treated acres is unavailable in the survey information related, estimates of treated area are calculated based on the avg. annual pounds acid equivalent (a.e.) applied, minimum max label rate, and maximum label rate found in the SUUM (**Equation 3-1, 3-2, 3-3**). In this situation, the maximum estimated treated acres are equal to the average reported annual pounds a.e. applied divided by the minimum max labeled application rate. The average number of treated acres is estimated by taking the number of average reported pounds applied and dividing by ½ of the maximum labeled application plus the minimum max labeled application rate. The minimum is generated by dividing the average reported pounds applied divided by the maximum labeled application rate. For glyphosate this method for estimating treated is only need for the average and minimum PCTs.

**Equation 3-1**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Annual pounds AI applied avg = | Annual average pounds applied of Acid equivalent |
| Label Ratemin= | Minimum application rate for the chemical in the SUUM (lb ai/a) |
| Treated Acresmax = | Estimated maximum treated acres based on label rates |

**Equation 3-2**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Annual pounds AI applied avg = | Annual average pounds applied of Acid equivalent |
| Label Rate min= | Minimum application rate for the chemical in the SUUM (lb ai/a) |
| Label Rate max = | Maximum application rate for the chemical in the SUUM (lb ai/a) |
| Treated Acres avg = | Estimated maximum treated acres based on label rates |

**Equation 3-3**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Annual pounds AI appliedavg = | Annual average pounds applied of Acid equivalent |
| Label Ratemax= | Maximum application rate for the chemical in the SUUM (lb ai/a) |
| Treated Acresmin = | Estimated minimum treated acres based on label rates |

To generate the PCTs the treated acres are divided by total treatable acres reported in the SUUM when available, or the estimated treatable acres based on the area found in the UDL **(Equation 4)**.

**Equation 4**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i = | PCT Estimate, max, avg, or min |
| Treated Acres= | Estimated treated acres |
| Total Treatable Acres= | Total treated acres as reported in the SUUM or estimated based on the UDL |

Due to the uncertainty in estimating the treated acres based on application rates, if a minimum PCT results in a value greater than the average, the minimum PCT is set equal to the average. The following sections provides additional information for each use sites based the corresponding UDL.

## Aquatic Herbicide

The available usage information for the aquatic herbicides UDL is regional and includes all use sites from the SUUM under the heading Aquatic Sites (including all bodies of fresh and brackish water that may be flowing, nonflowing or transient); information from the SUUM is summarized in Table 1. The treated acres reported in the SUUM are used for the maximum treated acres. Average and minimum treated acres for aquatic herbicides are estimated for each region using the label rates and the average annual pounds applied found in the SUUM. Total treatable area for the use was not reported in the survey information.

The number treated acres are divided by the number of potential use site acres in the region, based on the acres in the UDL, to generate each regional level PCT also summarized in Table 1. The regional PCT are applied to the aquatic herbicides UDL for each state in the region.

All PCTs estimates across all regions are below the default value of <2.5% and therefore this default value is used.

**Table 1. Glyphosate usage data (from SUUM) relevant to potential use sites with usage represented by Aquatic Herbicide UDL.**

| **Region a: Site** | | **Treatable Acres  b** | | **Max Acres Treatedc** | **Min Acres Treated e** | **Avg Acres Treated d** | **Avg. Annual Pounds AI Applied f** | **Max Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) g** | **Min Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) h** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| North Central: **Aquatic Herbicide** | | -- | | 100,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 200,000 | 8 | 8 |
| North Central Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 100,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  |  |
| North Central Total Possible Treatable Acres: Aquatic Herbicide | | | | 490,068,290 | 490,068,290 | 490,068,290 |  |  |  |
| North Central North Central PCT | | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast: **Aquatic Herbicide** | | | -- | 30,000 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 50,000 | 8 | 8 |
| Northeast Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 30,000 | 6,250 | 6,250 |  |  |  |
| Northeast Total Possible Treatable Acres: Aquatic Herbicide | | | | 104,278,000 | 104,278,000 | 104,278,000 |  |  |  |
| Northeast PCT | | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South: **Aquatic Herbicide** | -- | | | 7,000 | 1,250 | 1,250 | 10,000 | 8 | 8 |
| South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 7,000 | 1,250 | 1,250 |  |  |  |
| South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Aquatic Herbicide | | | | 212,015,110 | 212,015,110 | 212,015,110 |  |  |  |
| South PCT | | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deep South: **Aquatic Herbicide** | | | -- | 90,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 200,000 | 8 | 8 |
| Deep South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 90,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  |  |  |
| Deep South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Aquatic Herbicide | | | | 356,589,000 | 356,589,000 | 356,589,000 |  |  |  |
| Deep South PCT | | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West: **Aquatic Herbicide** | | | -- | 20,000 | 3,750 | 3,750 | 30,000 | 8 | 8 |
| West Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 20,000 | 3,750 | 3,750 |  |  |  |
| West Total Possible Treatable Acres: Aquatic Herbicide | | | | 759,192,420 | 759,192,420 | 759,192,420 |  |  |  |
| West PCT | | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |

a Geographic regions based on U.S. Census Bureau regions. Northeast (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NJ, NY, PA); North Central (ND, MN, WI, MI, OH, IN, IL, IA, ND, NE, SD, MO); West (WA, OR, CA, ID, NV, MT, WY, UT, CO, AZ, NM); South (OK, AR, TN, KY, WV, MD, DE, VA, NC); Deep South (TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC, FL)

b All possible treatable acres found nationally estimated based on the UDL.

c Average Annual treated acres reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) used as the estimated maximum acres

d Estimated average acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.i.a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and ½ of maximum single labeled rate plus the minimum max rate.

e Estimated minimum acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4)** and the maximum application rate of 8pounds a.i./a.

f The pounds AI displayed in this document may differ from those displayed in the SLUA and other BEAD documents, because different calculation methods were used.

g Maximum labeled rate as reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

h Minimum max labeled rate from 2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

i Default lowest PCT value of 2.5%

-- Data unavailable (not surveyed or surveyed but undisclosed in study).

## Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

For glyphosate, usage related to land found in the conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is not available. For this reason, 100% PCT was assumed. Further refinement may be considered in the final glyphosate BE assessment.

## Christmas trees

For glyphosate this use includes christmas tree crops, and usage specific to christmas trees is not available. For this reason, 100% PCT was assumed in states where christmas trees are grown. Further refinement may be considered in the final glyphosate BE assessment.

## Developed

The available usage information for the developed UDL is regional or national and includes all use sites from the SUUM under the heading Ornamental Lawns, Turf, and associated Ornamentals (in residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and government areas); information from the SUUM is summarized in **Table 2**. Regional usage information is available for developed -Applied by Lawn Care Operators and Applied by Landscape Contractors. For the national level usage data under the heading developed -Applied by Consumers estimated are proportions into each region based on the area of the UDL found in the UDL. The average annual treated acres reported in the SUUM are used for the maximum treated acres. Average and minimum treated acres for developed are estimated for each region using the label rates and the average annual pounds applied found in the SUUM. The estimated treated area is calculated for each of the uses by region then summed to calculate the estimated total area for the developed UDL. Total treatable area for the use was not reported in the survey information.

The total number of estimated treated acres is divided by the number of potential use site acres in the region, based on the acres in the UDL, to generate each regional level PCT also summarized in **Table 2.** The regional PCT are applied to the developed UDL for each state in the region.

All minimum and average PCTs estimates across all regions are below the default value of <2.5% and therefore this default value is used. The maximum PCTs range from the default value of <2.5% (South) to 5.4% (West).

Table 2. Glyphosate usage data (from SUUM) relevant to potential use sites represented by developed UDL.

| **Region a: Site** | | **Treatable Acres  b** | | **Max Acres Treated c** | **Min Acres Treated e** | **Avg Acres Treated d** | **Avg. Annual Pounds AI Applied f** | **Max Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) g** | **Min Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) h** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| North Central: **Applied by Landscape Contractors** | | -- | | 4,000 | 75 | 125 | 3,000 | 40 | 8 |
| North Central: **Applied by Lawn Care Operators** | | -- | | 200,000 | 5,000 | 8,333 | 200,000 | 40 | 8 |
| North Central: **Applied by Consumers** | | -- | | 176,654 | 35,331 | 58,885 | 5,000,000 | 40 | 8 |
| North Central Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 380,654 | 40,406 | 67,343 |  |  |  |
| North Central Total Possible Treatable Acres: Developed | | | | 13,335,284 | 13,335,284 | 13,335,284 |  |  |  |
| North Central PCT | | | | 2.9 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast: **Applied by Landscape Contractors** | | | -- | 5,000 | 250 | 417 | 10,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Northeast: **Applied by Lawn Care Operators** | | | -- | 100,000 | 5,000 | 8,333 | 200,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Northeast: **Applied by Consumers** | | | -- | 77,617 | 15,523 | 25,872 | 5,000,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Northeast Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 182,617 | 20,773 | 34,622 |  |  |  |
| Northeast Total Possible Treatable Acres: Developed | | | | 5,859,172 | 5,859,172 | 5,859,172 |  |  |  |
| Northeast PCT | | | | 3.1 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South: **Applied by Landscape Contractors** | -- | | | 60,000 | 2,500 | 4,167 | 100,000 | 40 | 8 |
| South: **Applied by Lawn Care Operators** | -- | | | 10,000 | 750 | 1,250 | 30,000 | 40 | 8 |
| South: **Applied by Consumers** | -- | | | 83,440 | 16,688 | 27,813 | 5,000,000 | 40 | 8 |
| South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 153,440 | 19,938 | 33,230 |  |  |  |
| South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Developed | | | | 6,298,734 | 6,298,734 | 6,298,734 |  |  |  |
| South PCT | | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deep South: **Applied by Landscape Contractors** | | | -- | 30,000 | 1,500 | 2,500 | 60,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Deep South: **Applied by Lawn Care Operators** | | | -- | 300,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 600,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Deep South: **Applied by Consumers** | | | -- | 158,015 | 31,603 | 52,672 | 5,000,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Deep South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 488,015 | 48,103 | 80,172 |  |  |  |
| Deep South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Developed | | | | 11,928,259 | 11,928,259 | 11,928,259 |  |  |  |
| Deep South PCT | | | | 4.1 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West: **Applied by Landscape Contractors** | | | -- | 200,000 | 7,500 | 12,500 | 300,000 | 40 | 8 |
| West: **Applied by Lawn Care Operators** | | | -- | 200,000 | 10,000 | 16,667 | 400,000 | 40 | 8 |
| West: **Applied by Consumers** | | | -- | 129,274 | 25,855 | 43,091 | 5,000,000 | 40 | 8 |
| West Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | | 529,274 | 43,355 | 72,258 |  |  |  |
| West Total Possible Treatable Acres: Developed | | | | 9,758,620 | 9,758,620 | 9,758,620 |  |  |  |
| West PCT | | | | 5.4 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |

a Geographic regions based on U.S. Census Bureau regions. Northeast (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NJ, NY, PA); North Central (ND, MN, WI, MI, OH, IN, IL, IA, ND, NE, SD, MO); West (WA, OR, CA, ID, NV, MT, WY, UT, CO, AZ, NM); South (OK, AR, TN, KY, WV, MD, DE, VA, NC); Deep South (TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC, FL)

b All possible treatable acres found nationally estimated based on the UDL.

c Average Annual treated acres reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) used as the estimated maximum acres for **Applied by Landscape Contractors** and **Applied by Lawn Care Operators.** The **Applied by Consumers** max acres treated estimated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and the minimum max rate.

d Estimated average acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and ½ of maximum single labeled rate plus the minimum max rate.

e Estimated minimum acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4)** and the maximum application rate of 40 pounds a.e./a.

f The pounds AI displayed in this document may differ from those displayed in the SLUA and other BEAD documents, because different calculation methods were used.

g Maximum labeled rate as reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

h Minimum max labeled rate from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

i Default lowest PCT value of 2.5%

-- Data unavailable (not surveyed or surveyed but undisclosed in study).

## Forest trees

The available usage information for the forest trees UDL is regional and includes all use sites from the SUUM under the heading Forestry (production areas or plantations including site preparation, mid-rotation and other release treatments, timber stand improvement, poplar production, silvicultural nursery sites, reforestation treatments and maintaining logging roads) with the exception of christmas trees, which are assess separately; information from the SUUM is summarized in **Table 3**. The average annual treated acres reported in the SUUM are used for the maximum treated acres. Average and minimum treated acres for forest trees are estimated using the label rates and the average annual pounds applied for each region based on the information found in the SUUM. Total Treatable area for the use was not reported in the survey information.

The number of estimated treated acres is divided by the number of potential use site acres in the region, based on the acres in the UDL, to generate each regional level PCT, also summarized in **Table 3.** The regional PCT are applied to the forest trees UDL for each state in the region.

All PCTs estimates across all regions are below the default value of <2.5% and therefore this default value is used.

**Table 3. Glyphosate usage data (from SUUM) for the forest tree UDL based on usage from the National Forest Service.**

| **Region a: Site** | **Treatable Acres  b** | **Max Acres Treated c** | **Min Acres Treated e** | **Avg Acres Treated d** | **Avg. Annual Pounds AI Applied f** | **Max Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) g** | **Min Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) h** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| North Central: **Forestry** | -- | 10,000 | 750 | 1,444 | 30,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| North Central Total Estimated Treated Acres | | 10,000 | 750 | 1,444 |  |  |  |
| North Central Total Possible Treatable Acres: Forest Trees | | 17,527,722 | 17,527,722 | 17,527,722 |  |  |  |
| North Central PCT | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast: **Forestry** | -- | 30,000 | 1,750 | 3,369 | 70,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Northeast Total Estimated Treated Acres | | 30,000 | 1,750 | 3,369 |  |  |  |
| Northeast Total Possible Treatable Acres: Forest Trees | | 8,634,869 | 8,634,869 | 8,634,869 |  |  |  |
| Northeast PCT | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South/Deep South: **Forestry** | -- | 600,000 | 92,500 | 178,100 | 3,700,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| South/Deep South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | 600,000 | 92,500 | 178,100 |  |  |  |
| South/Deep South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Forest Trees | | 133,753,722 | 133,753,722 | 133,753,722 |  |  |  |
| South/Deep South PCT | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West: **Forestry** | -- | 200,000 | 10,000 | 19,250 | 400,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| West Total Estimated Treated Acres | | 200,000 | 10,000 | 19,250 |  |  |  |
| West Total Possible Treatable Acres: Forest Trees | | 111,420,091 | 111,420,091 | 111,420,091 |  |  |  |
| West PCT | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |

a Geographic regions based on U.S. Census Bureau regions. Northeast (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NJ, NY, PA); North Central (ND, MN, WI, MI, OH, IN, IL, IA, ND, NE, SD, MO); West (WA, OR, CA, ID, NV, MT, WY, UT, CO, AZ, NM); South (OK, AR, TN, KY, WV, MD, DE, VA, NC); Deep South (TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC, FL)

b All possible treatable acres found nationally estimated based on the UDL.

c Average Annual treated acres reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) used as the estimated maximum acres

d Estimated average acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and ½ of maximum single labeled rate plus the minimum max rate.

e Estimated minimum acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4)** and the maximum application rate of 40pounds a.e./a.

f The pounds AI displayed in this document may differ from those displayed in the SLUA and other BEAD documents, because different calculation methods were used.

g Maximum labeled rate as reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

h Minimum max labeled rate from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

i Default lowest PCT value of 2.5%

-- Data unavailable (not surveyed or surveyed but undisclosed in study).

## Noncultivated

For glyphosate this use includes non-cropland not covered by other non-agricultural uses. Usage is not available for this site. For this reason, 100% PCT was assumed. Further refinement may be considered in the final glyphosate BE assessment.

## Nurseries

The available usage information for the nurseries UDL is regional and includes all use sites from the SUUM under the heading Nursery and Greenhouse Ornamentals; information from the SUUM is summarized in Table 4. The average annual treated acres reported in the SUUM are used for the maximum treated acres. Average and minimum treated acres for each region are estimated using the label rates and the average annual pounds applied found in the SUUM. Total treatable area for the use was not reported in the survey information.

The number of estimated treated acres is divided by the number of potential use site acres in the region , based on the acres in the UDL, to generate each regional level PCT also summarized in Table 4.The regional PCT are applied to the nurseries UDL for each state in the region.

The PCTs range from 2.7% to 100% across estimates and regions, the maximum PCT reaches 100% for all regions except the North Central.

**Table 4. Summarized regional glyphosate usage data (from SUUM) relevant to potential use sites for the nurseries UDL.**

| **Region a: Site** | **Treatable Acres  b** | | **Max Acres Treated c** | **Min Acres Treated e** | **Avg Acres Treated d** | **Avg. Annual Pounds AI Applied f** | **Max Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) g** | **Min Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) h** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| North Central: **Nursery and Greenhouse Ornamentals** | -- | | 40,000 | 2,000 | 3,333 | 80,000 | 40 | 8 |
| North Central Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 40,000 | 2,000 | 3,333 |  |  |  |
| North Central Total Possible Treatable Acres: Nurseries | | | 74,192 | 74,192 | 74,192 |  |  |  |
| North Central PCT | | | 53.9 | 2.7 | 4.5 |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast: **Nursery and Greenhouse Ornamentals** | | -- | 200,000 | 7,500 | 12,500 | 300,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Northeast Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 200,000 | 7,500 | 12,500 |  |  |  |
| Northeast Total Possible Treatable Acres: Nurseries | | | 41,654 | 41,654 | 41,654 |  |  |  |
| Northeast PCT | | | 100 | 18 | 30 |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South: **Nursery and Greenhouse Ornamentals** | | -- | 500,000 | 22,500 | 37,500 | 900,000 | 40 | 8 |
| South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 500,000 | 22,500 | 37,500 |  |  |  |
| South Possible Treatable Acres: Nurseries | | | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 |  |  |  |
| Deep South PCT | | | 100 | 60 | 100 |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deep South: **Nursery and Greenhouse Ornamentals** | | -- | 70,000 | 2,500 | 4,167 | 100,000 | 40 | 8 |
| Deep South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 70,000 | 2,500 | 4,167 |  |  |  |
| Deep South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Nurseries | | | 56,873 | 56,873 | 56,873 |  |  |  |
| Deep South PCT | | | 100 | 4.4 | 7.3 |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West: **Nursery and Greenhouse Ornamentals** | | -- | 200,000 | 10,000 | 16,667 | 400,000 | 40 | 8 |
| West Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 200,000 | 10,000 | 16,667 |  |  |  |
| West Total Possible Treatable Acres: Nurseries | | | 42,105 | 42,105 | 42,105 |  |  |  |
| West PCT | | | 100 | 23.8 | 39.6 |  |  |  |

a Geographic regions based on U.S. Census Bureau regions. Northeast (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NJ, NY, PA); North Central (ND, MN, WI, MI, OH, IN, IL, IA, ND, NE, SD, MO); West (WA, OR, CA, ID, NV, MT, WY, UT, CO, AZ, NM); South (OK, AR, TN, KY, WV, MD, DE, VA, NC); Deep South (TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC, FL)

b All possible treatable acres found nationally estimated based on the UDL.

c Average Annual treated acres reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) used as the estimated maximum acres

d Estimated average acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and ½ of maximum single labeled rate plus the minimum max rate.

e Estimated minimum acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4)** and the maximum application rate of 40 pounds a.e./a.

f The pounds AI displayed in this document may differ from those displayed in the SLUA and other BEAD documents, because different calculation methods were used.

g Maximum labeled rate as reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

h Minimum max labeled rate from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

i Default lowest PCT value of 2.5%

-- Data unavailable (not surveyed or surveyed but undisclosed in study).

## Open space developed

The available usage information for the open space developed UDL is regional and includes all use sites from the SUUM under the heading Institutional Turf Facilities and Golf Courses; information from the SUUM is summarized in Table 5. The average annual treated acres reported in the SUUM are used for the maximum treated acres. Average and minimum treated acres open space developed are estimated for each region using the label rates and the average annual pounds applied found in the SUUM. The estimated treated area is calculated for each of the uses then summed to calculate the estimated total area for the open space developed UDL. Total treatable area for the use was not reported in the survey information.

The total number of estimated treated acres is divided by the number of potential use site acres in the region , based on the acres in the UDL, to generate each regional level PCT also summarized in Table 5.The regional PCT are applied to the open space developed UDL for each state in the region.

All minimum and average PCTs estimates across all regions are below the default value of <2.5% and therefore this default value is used. The maximum PCTs range from the default value of <2.5% (North Central, and Northeast) to 2.8% (Deep South).

**Table 5. Summarized regional glyphosate usage data (from SUUM) relevant to all potential use sites represented by open space developed UDL.**

| **Region a: Site** | **Treatable Acres  b** | | **Max Acres Treated c** | **Min Acres Treated e** | **Avg Acres Treated d** | **Avg. Annual Pounds AI Applied f** | **Max Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) g** | **Min Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) h** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| North Central: **Golf Courses** | -- | | 6,000 | 500 | 960 | 20,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| North Central: **Institutional Turf Facilities** | -- | | 100,000 | 7,500 | 14,440 | 300,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| North Central Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 106,000 | 8,000 | 15,400 |  |  |  |
| North Central Total Possible Treatable Acres: Open Spaced Developed | | | 20,629,764 | 20,629,764 | 20,629,764 |  |  |  |
| North Central PCT | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast: **Golf Courses** | | -- | 7,000 | 500 | 960 | 20,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Northeast: **Institutional Turf Facilities** | | -- | 70,000 | 5,000 | 9,627 | 200,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Northeast Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 77,000 | 5,500 | 10,590 |  |  |  |
| Northeast Total Possible Treatable Acres: Open Spaced Developed | | | 5,905,377 | 5,905,377 | 5,905,377 |  |  |  |
| Northeast PCT | | | <fr2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South: **Golf Courses** | | -- | 50,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| South: **Institutional Turf Facilities** | | -- | 50,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 100,000 | 5,000 | 9,625 |  |  |  |
| South Possible Treatable Acres: Open Spaced Developed | | | 11,588,907 | 11,588,907 | 11,588,907 |  |  |  |
| Deep South PCT | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deep South: **Golf Courses** | | -- | 60,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Deep South: **Institutional Turf Facilities** | | -- | 400,000 | 20,000 | 38,508 | 800,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Deep South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 460,000 | 22,500 | 43,321 |  |  |  |
| Deep South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Open Spaced Developed | | | 16,518,545 | 16,518,545 | 16,518,545 |  |  |  |
| Deep South PCT | | | 2.8 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West: **Golf Courses** | | -- | 60,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| West: **Institutional Turf Facilities** | | -- | 200,000 | 10,000 | 19,254 | 400,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| West Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 260,000 | 12,500 | 24,067 |  |  |  |
| West Total Possible Treatable Acres: Open Spaced Developed | | | 10,378,008 | 10,378,008 | 10,378,008 |  |  |  |
| West PCT | | | 2.5 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |

a Geographic regions based on U.S. Census Bureau regions. Northeast (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NJ, NY, PA); North Central (ND, MN, WI, MI, OH, IN, IL, IA, ND, NE, SD, MO); West (WA, OR, CA, ID, NV, MT, WY, UT, CO, AZ, NM); South (OK, AR, TN, KY, WV, MD, DE, VA, NC); Deep South (TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC, FL)

b All possible treatable acres found nationally estimated based on the UDL.

c Average Annual treated acres reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) used as the estimated maximum acres

d Estimated average acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and ½ of maximum single labeled rate plus the minimum max rate.

e Estimated minimum acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4)** and the maximum application rate of 40 pounds a.e./a.

f The pounds AI displayed in this document may differ from those displayed in the SLUA and other BEAD documents, because different calculation methods were used.

g Maximum labeled rate as reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) from Report 2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

h Minimum max labeled rate from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

i Default lowest PCT value of 2.5%

-- Data unavailable (not surveyed or surveyed but undisclosed in study).

## Right of way

The available usage information for the right of way UDL is regional and includes all use sites from the SUUM under the heading Rights of Way; information from the SUUM is summarized in Table 6. The average annual treated acres reported in the SUUM are used for the maximum treated acres. Average and minimum treated acres for right of way are estimated using the label rates and the average annual pounds applied for each region found in the SUUM. The estimated treated area is calculated for each of the uses then summed to calculate the estimated total area for the right of way UDL. Total treatable area for the use was not reported in the survey information.

The number of estimated treated acres is divided by the number of potential use site acres in the region, based on the acres in the UDL, to generate each regional level PCT also summarized in Table 6. The regional PCT are applied to the right of way UDL for each state in the region.

All minimum and average PCTs estimates across all regions are below the default value of <2.5% and therefore this default value is used. The maximum PCTs range from the default value of <2.5% (North Central) to 6.1% (South).

**Table 6. Glyphosate usage data (from SUUM) relevant to potential use sites with usage represented by right of way UDL.**

| **Region a: Site** | **Treatable Acres  b** | | **Max Acres Treated c** | **Min Acres Treated e** | **Avg Acres Treated d** | **Avg. Annual Pounds AI Applied f** | **Max Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) g** | **Min Single Labeled Rate (lb AI/A) h** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| North Central: **Roadways** | -- | | 200,000 | 10,000 | 19,254 | 400,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| North Central: **Railways** | -- | | 200,000 | 7,500 | 14,440 | 300,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| North Central: **Utility and Pipeline ROWs** | -- | | 80,000 | 5,000 | 9,627 | 200,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| North Central Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 480,654 | 22,500 | 43,321 |  |  | ` |
| North Central Total Possible Treatable Acres: Right of Way | | | 30,534,085 | 30,534,085 | 30,534,085 |  |  |  |
| North Central PCT | | | <2.5i | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast: **Roadways** | -- | | 300,000 | 15,000 | 28,881 | 600,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Northeast: **Railways** | -- | | 20,000 | 500 | 963 | 20,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Northeast: **Utility and Pipeline ROWs** | -- | | 50,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| Northeast Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 370,000 | 18,000 | 34,650 |  | ` |  |
| Northeast Total Possible Treatable Acres: Right of Way | | | 10,767,394 | 10,767,394 | 10,767,394 |  |  |  |
| Northeast PCT | | | 3.4 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South/Deep South: **Roadways** | | -- | 1,200,000 | 55,000 | 105,897 | 2,200,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| South/Deep South: **Railways** | | -- | 80,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| South/Deep South: **Utility and Pipeline ROWs** | | -- | 200,000 | 10,000 | 19,254 | 400,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| South/Deep South Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 1,480,000 | 67,500 | 695,900 |  |  | ` |
| South/Deep South Total Possible Treatable Acres: Right of Way | | | 24,290,003 | 24,290,003 | 24,290,003 |  |  |  |
| South PCT | | | 6.1 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West: **Roadways** | -- | | 1,100,000 | 40,000 | 77,016 | 1,600,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| West: **Railways** | -- | | 60,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| West: **Utility and Pipeline ROWs** | -- | | 30,000 | 2,500 | 4,813 | 100,000 | 40 | 1.6 |
| West Total Estimated Treated Acres | | | 1,190,000 | 45,000 | 86,650 |  | ` |  |
| West Total Possible Treatable Acres: Right of Way | | | 30,408,733 | 30,408,733 | 30,408,733 |  |  |  |
| West PCT | | | 5.4 | <2.5i | <2.5i |  |  |  |

a Geographic regions based on U.S. Census Bureau regions. Northeast (ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI, NJ, NY, PA); North Central (ND, MN, WI, MI, OH, IN, IL, IA, ND, NE, SD, MO); West (WA, OR, CA, ID, NV, MT, WY, UT, CO, AZ, NM); South (OK, AR, TN, KY, WV, MD, DE, VA, NC); Deep South (TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC, FL)

b All possible treatable acres found nationally estimated based on the UDL.

c Average Annual treated acres reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) used as the estimated maximum acres

d Estimated average acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) and ½ of maximum single labeled rate plus the minimum max rate.

e Estimated minimum acres treated by dividing the avg. annual pounds a.e. applied in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4)** and the maximum application rate of 40 pounds a.e./a.

f The pounds AI displayed in this document may differ from those displayed in the SLUA and other BEAD documents, because different calculation methods were used.

g Maximum labeled rate as reported in the SUUM (**APPENDIX 1-4**) from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

h Minimum max labeled rate from Report2013 JGTF Use Matrix.

i Default lowest PCT value of 2.5%

-- Data unavailable (not surveyed or surveyed but undisclosed in study).

1. Applying Surrogate Usage Data

Some uses are not surveyed for usage at all and some uses are only surveyed for usage in some states. For crops without surveyed usage that are included in aggregated UDLs, usage data from the same state for other crops in the UDL will be used as surrogates. If no data for crops within a UDL are available in a state, surrogate PCT will be applied using data available for the same crop or UDL but a different state. If a UDL has no usage data for any state, the highest available PCT from all state-crop combinations will be used. The decision tree below (Figure 2) outlines the approach for determining which data will be used as surrogates.

The surrogacy approach is designed to use the best available data to identify the likely extent of treated area when usage data are not available for a given crop. Surrogate data are ideally assigned using crops within the same UDL landcover and then using data from the same crop but different spatial location. If the first two options are not possible, then a conservative approach is employed where the greatest extent of usage on any crop-state combination is used as the surrogate. After applying the surrogacy method all UDL/state combinations will have an associated aggregated PCT. Use of surrogate data represents an uncertainty. In cases where a species has potential risk concerns, a Weight of Evidence analysis will be conducted prior to making the NLAA/LAA determination. In this Weight of Evidence analysis, the impact of the surrogacy assumptions on the overlap analysis will be considered.

Yes

Is crop-specific PCT available for assessed state?

No

No

No

Yes

Is use surveyed in other states?

Yes

Is a PCT available for a use within the same UDL and state?

**Figure 2. Decision framework for applying surrogate usage data.**

1. Calculation of Extent of Direct Overlap of Species Range or Critical Habitat and Treated Acres

The aggregate PCT is used to calculate the total number of acres treated within a state for each UDL (PCT x total acres within a UDL = total acres treated for a UDL). The approach described above combines data that are at different spatial scales, *i.e.,* 30-meter pixel, county and state, for UDLs, Census of Agriculture and usage, respectively. Because of the differences in scales, the usage of glyphosate can be limited to county and sub-county areas representing potential use sites; however, the actual location of the treated acres within the state is unknown.

Three different assumptions are employed to represent how the treated acres are attributed to potential use site acres within the species range (or critical habitat): upper bound (concentrated within the species range), uniform distribution, and lower bound (concentrated outside of species range). Each of these approaches are discussed below. In all three approaches the estimated treated area within the species range (or critical habitat) is used to calculate the direct overlap of treated sites and the species range (or critical habitat). Direct overlap is equal to the total treated area within the species range divided by the total area of the species range (or critical habitat).

The upper bound approach assumes that all the treated acres in a state occur within the species range (or critical habitat) to the greatest extent possible. In this approach, the total acres treated for the state are calculated using the aggregated PCTs. The total treated acres for the state are compared to the total number of acres within a species’ range that overlaps with that UDL. If the number of treated acres in a state is greater than the number of acres in the UDL that overlap the species range, it will be assumed that all acres within the species range that overlap with the UDL are treated, with the excess treated acres assumed to occur outside of the species range. As described above, treated acres are only placed in counties within the species range where at least 1 registered labeled use for the UDL occurs, as identified by Census of Agriculture. If the number of treated acres is less than the total number of UDL acres that overlap with the species’ range, then it is assumed that all treated acres for the state in that UDL occur inside of the range of a species.

For the uniform distribution approach, the aggregated PCT is applied directly to the acres of the UDL occurring within the species range or critical habitat to calculate the estimated treated acres. This approach assumes that the treated acres are distributed uniformly throughout the state.

The lower bound approach is essentially the opposite of the upper bound. In the lower bound approach, it is assumed that the treated acres are distributed outside of the species range to the greatest extent possible. The total acres treated for the state are compared to the total number of acres outside of a species’ range for the UDL. If the number of treated acres in a state is greater than the number of acres of UDL outside of the species range, it will be assumed that all acres outside the species range are treated, with the excess treated acres assumed to occur within the species range. If the number of treated acres is less than those outside of the species’ range, it is assumed that all treated acres for the state in that UDL occur outside of the range of a species.

When a species range spans multiple states, the uniform, upper, and lower bound approaches are individually applied to each state relevant to a species. The treated acres across all pertinent states are summed to calculate the number of treated acres overlapping with the whole species range (or critical habitat).

The calculation of total treated area based on the temporally aggregated UDLs likely overestimates the area where crops could be found on the same land in a given year and is a conservatism in the process. The upper bound method, which concentrates all the treated acres in the species range (or critical habitat), frequently results in more treated area for a given state than expected when considering all cropped acres in the state. Additional assumptions and uncertainties related to this the calculation of total treated acres and the distributions of the treated acres related to the species range (or critical habitat) are presented in the Revised Method**.**

1. Calculation of Composite Drift Layer Overlapping with Species Range or Critical Habitat

To account for the potential effects of drift beyond the specifically treated acres, when the action area is derived, each relevant UDL is combined into a composite layer representing all potential uses. The composite layer is generated by placing all relevant UDLs on top of each other and merging them together to set the footprint for the chemical as a single layer. This composite layer is then extended out in all directions based on the application method with the greatest drift potential for the chemical. For glyphosate this is the aerial application, resulting in a maximum buffer distance of 2600 ft, or approximately 792 meters. For an individual species, the composite drift area is then refined by considering only the uses with overlap when applying the maximum buffer for the chemical. The specific application methods and rates relevant to these uses and the species-specific endpoints that result in the farthest distance from the treated field, where effects may occur, are used to determine the extent of the composite drift layer for that species.

When usage data are considered, it is necessary to account for a decrease in the extent of areas receiving spray drift because the actual treated area is less than the total cropped acres in the UDL. The total possible area receiving drift is based on all potential use site found in the action area. Prior to applying usage, potential drift in all directions is calculated. After applying usage, only a portion of potential use sites in the action area will be treated, thus changing the drift extent originally calculated based on all potential use sites.

Since the actual location of the treated acres within a state is unknown, specific areas are not buffered in the Step 2 approach of the Revised Method[[3]](#footnote-4). To account for the reduction in acres treated based on usage data, a factor is applied to this composite drift area based on a state aggregated PCT for all of the uses combined. Additionally, a factor is applied to account for the distribution of theses acres under an upper bound (maximum acres within the species range), lower bound (maximum acres outside the species range) or uniformly distributed within the range as previously discussed. The distribution of acres within the state relative to the species range will also affect the impact of spray drift. For the upper bound scenario, no additional factor is applied to the aggregated PCT, but for the uniform and minimum scenarios, the ratio of the number of treated acres calculated for the uniform or lower bound scenario to the upper bound scenario is applied to the PCT. Lastly, to account for the uncertainty in the true spatial distribution of the use sites, as well as the uncertainty of multiple sites potentially impacting the same locations, the adjusted PCT value is rounded up to the nearest ten place value (*e.g.,* factor of 0.056 is rounded to 0.1). This composite factor is used to scale the number of acres impacted by off-site drift and subsequently lower the total predicted overlap with a species range (or critical habitat) due to drift, when compared to the overlap which might occur if all treatable acres were assumed to be treated.

Another factor often discussed for consideration in spray drift is the impact of wind direction on off-site transport for species ranges that are impacted by spray drift occurring in all directions. Methods have been proposed in the past to account for this, including the use of wind rose plots to better predict off-site movement of a chemical. As a simplified method to account for the impacts of wind direction, an additional factor is applied to spray drift based on the number of applications that can occur for the use patterns that are relevant to a species. For the composite factor determined above, a wind direction scaling factor is applied where the factor is scaled to 25% for each application allowed, to represent movement of a chemical off-site in only one direction, or essentially ¼ of a circle when one application is made. More specifically, if only one yearly application is allowed for the relevant use sites, a factor of 0.25 is applied, if 2 applications are allowed, a factor of 0.5, if 3 applications are allowed, a factor of 0.75 and if 4 or more applications are allowed, a factor of 1 (or no additional scaling is applied). The equations used to scale the spray drift overlap are provided below in **Equation 5** and **Equation 6**.

**Equation 5.**

**Equation 6.**

In summary, the number of acres in a species range (or critical habitat) potentially exposed due to spray drift is calculated using the equations above for each state. This total number of acres is then divided by the total acres in the species range to determine the overlap area due to drift. For predicting relative EECs in the drift zone, the number of acres is further refined to how many are in each 30-meter increment off-site; starting at 30 meters and continuing to 792 meters off-site or the limit of aerial drift. Additional uncertainties and conservatism of the method for applying usage data to drift are provided in the Revised Method.

1. Determination of Overlap of Exposure Area and Species Range or Critical Habitat

To determine the total overlap exposure area, the total number of treated acres within the species range (direct overlap) are added to the scaled number of acres receiving spray drift then divided by the total number of acres of the species range (or critical habitat). This can be considered the percent of the species range/habitat that is likely to be exposed to the pesticide of interest, based on usage data and predicted spray drift. For species whose life history information indicates the species will not utilize the potential use site areas, overlap of direct treated sites will be zero for direct exposure and only the scaled areas receiving spray drift are considered for the species overlap.

There are 5 different overlap scenarios generated for consideration. The first represents the unadjusted or pesticide usage independent overlap, the 2nd and 3rd incorporate the chemical specific usage information and accounts for the redundancy in the UDL layers, and the 4th and 5th incorporate species life history information by removing direct overlap if the species will not utilize the potential use site and limiting the overlap extent to just the areas represented by suitable habitat. These 5 overlap scenarios are discussed in more detail in the following section.

When considering the three different assumptions related to distribution of treated acres relative to species range (*i.e.,* concentrated in species range (upper), uniform throughout state (uniform) and concentrated outside of species range (lower)) and the three different assumptions regarding the amount of usage on a given year (*i.e.,* maximum, average or minimum annual PCT), there are 9 different estimates of the overlap of the species range (or critical habitat) and the exposure area for each overlap scenario. The overlap estimates for pertinent scenarios are considered in addition to the influence of using surrogate usage data when none are available as part of the Weight of Evidence. This information is considered in the Weight of Evidence to determine the likelihood that an individual will be exposed and adversely affected.

1. Background - Spatial Co-occurrence of Species Location and Potential Use Sites

The co-occurrence analysis identifies if a species range (or critical habitat) and UDL overlap, and if so by how much. Required inputs to conducting the co-occurrence analysis include a list of species, species location files, pesticide Use Data Layers (UDLs), and any additional supporting species life history information used to supplement the analysis. The species list needs to include all species and designated critical habitat subjects to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Location files for each species range and critical habitat need to be accounted for prior to use in the co-occurrence analysis. The pesticide Use Data Layers (UDLs) representing each label use also need to be accounted for prior to completing the analysis. Finally, any additional species life history or spatial datasets, (*e.g.,* GAP/Landfire habitat layer) used to supplement the co-occurrence analysis need to be identified. Additional detail on these spatial inputs and the tools use to generated them can be found with the BE models/tools.

All inputs are finalized and standardized using the Co-occurrence Inputs-Species/Use and Supporting Tables tool. The co-occurrence analysis leverages the ArcGIS Tabulate Area tool, executed as a batch using Chemical Independent Co-occurrence Results-Parent Use Overlap Tables tool. The Chemical Dependent Co-occurrence Results-MAGtool Tables tool generates the standard output tables summarized by UDL and species used in the BE; incorporating usage and species life information into the results. The five different overlap scenarios are generated as output from this tool. Additional information on each of these tools can be found with the respective tool documentation.

The first overlap scenario provides a usage independent overlap, without any adjustments to account for usage or species life history. The remaining overlap scenarios apply usage and species information to the overlap. First the aggregated PCTs for glyphosate, described above, are applied to the species/UDL overlap using the three different distribution methods for the treated acres. Following the application of usage information, results are scaled to account for the redundancy in the UDLs. Additional detail on the method for applying the redundancy scaling factors is provided below. The last two overlap scenarios account for species life history information. First, if the species will not utilize the potential use site directly the overlap representing the direct overlap is excluded, limiting the results to the areas of drift overlap. Lastly, if the species is more likely to use certain habitats this can be considered by limiting the extent of overlap to just the areas of the species range with those habitats. This suitable habitat consideration is not applicable to designated critical habitat and is considered in conjunction with the results representing the full range as part of the Weight of evidence.

1. Input Data Used for Co-occurrence Analysis
   1. Master Species List

Species subject to section 7 under the Endangered Species Act are obtained from the US Fish and Wildlife Threatened and Endangered Species System[[4]](#footnote-5) (TESS). The resulting table is filtered to include listing statuses[[5]](#footnote-6) currently subject to section 7 or potentially subject to section 7 during the registration time period. Information from TESS for species under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is supplemented with information from the NMFS website[[6]](#footnote-7), deferring to the NMFS website if conflicts exist between the sources. The species list used for this assessment was generated in January 2019.

* 1. Species Locations

The FWS ECOS Portal (<http://ecos.fws.gov>) houses spatial data that represents species’ ranges and designated critical habitat[[7]](#footnote-8). Managed by the species experts and therefore considered the best available information for section 7 consultation, the co-occurrence analysis utilizing this information. The ECOS Portal points users to NMFS websites to access spatial information for species under NMFS jurisdiction not found on the ECOS website. For NMFS species not found in either location a request was made directly to the NMFS scientists. The last download of the species locations occurred in January 2019.

After accounting for each species, the input files used for the co-occurrence analysis are generated with the ESRI ArcGIS Union Toolbox[[8]](#footnote-9). The union tool generates the geometric union of the species files and their attributes presented as non-overlapping ‘zones’. Each unique zone may be occupied by multiple species. The species found in each zone are tracked in a look-up table generated at the time of the union. By using these non-overlapping ‘zones’ a given location is only run once in the analysis, rather than for each overlapping species.

Additional information on this process can be found with the Co-occurrence Inputs-Species/Use and Supporting Tables tool.

* 1. Use Data Layers (UDLs)

The data and process to generate the Use Data Layers is described in **APPENDIX 1-5 and APPENDIX 1-6.**

* 1. Other Inputs


In addition to the usage data and Census of Agriculture described above, species life history information can be considered. Species life history information is incorporated into two of the overlap scenarios. The first considers if the species will be found on potential use sites or exclusively off the use sites. Off use site determinations were made based on species documentation generated by the Services (*e.g.* Recovery Plan, 5-year Reviews). These determinations were reviewed and updated based on feedback provided by US Fish and Wildlife Service in the Fall of 2019[[9]](#footnote-10). The second consideration includes suitable habitat for a species, and the habitats where a species is likely to occur be are exacted from the GAP/Landfire [[10]](#footnote-11) Overlap specific to these habitat areas are generated. The overlap for the suitable habitat is used to supplement the overlap for the full species range.

All spatial files, UDLs, species, and supplemental information, are standardized into the selected regional projections prior to use in the co-occurrence analysis. For the contiguous United States, there is only one projection used, Albers Conical Equal Area projections (Albers\_Conical\_Equal\_Area.prj). Projected coordinated system were selected to preserve area calculations.

1. Co-occurrence Analysis

The co-occurrence analysis uses the ArcGIS Tabulate Area tool, executed as a batch with the Chemical Independent Co-occurrence Results-Parent Use Overlap Tables tool. Additional information on this tool can be found with the tool documentation. As described above, the species input files used for the co-occurrence are generated by ESRI ArcGIS Union Toolbox, which creates a series of non-overlapping ‘zones’. Each unique zone may be occupied by multiple species. **Figure 3** provides an example species range, and the same range broken up into the non-overlapping ‘zones’ used as the species input file.

In order to apply usage and Census of Agriculture information the state and county boundaries are added to the species input files using the ESRI Intersect Toolbox. The final ‘zones’ allows for the overlap of a UDL to be reported out by species for a given county or state. The state and county breaks allow for the application of the usage data. The total overlap for each county and state is also calculated so the treated acres for the state can be calculated for the upper and lower distributions of treated acres described above.



**Figure 3. Example of species range represented by zones used as the input for the co-occurrence analysis, including species location and counties boundaries.**


* 1. Overlap Scenarios

Five different overlap scenarios are generated for consideration in the Weight of Evidence. The first is usage independent and provides results for the species with no adjustment to the overlap. This is followed by incorporating the usage data, scaling for redundancy of the UDLs, and then adding species life history information to the overlap results.

Applying the usage method described above, the aggregated PCTs and Census of Agricultural are applied to the state and county results to calculate the total treated acres for the state. This information is used for the upper and lower distribution of the treated acres. The treated acres are concentrated within the species range (or critical habitat) and the given state for the upper distribution or outside the species range (or critical habitat) and within the given state for the lower distribution. For the uniform distribution, the aggregated PCTs and Census of Agricultural are applied directly to the species results, broken down for a species in a given county and state. After calculating the treated acres for each state within the species range (or critical habitat), all states are summed to get the total treated acres for the species. This process is completed for all UDLs and each of the aggregated PCTs; minimum, maximum and average. The five overlap scenarios are:

* Overlap Scenario 1: Unadjusted
* Overlap Scenario 2: PCT Overlap
* Overlap Scenario 3:PCT and Redundancy
* Overlap Scenario 4:PCT, Redundancy, Off-site
* Overlap Scenario 5: PCT, Redundancy, Off-site, Habitat

**Figure 4** provides an example of the three distribution of the treated acres. The dark gray is the extent of the UDL, the green area represents the treated area for a PCT of 10% for the state. These treated acres are distributed into the species range, in orange, using the three different methods; upper to the left, uniform in the middle and lower to the right. Prior to incorporating usage all area in the UDL is assumed to be treated.





**Upper Uniform Lower**

**Figure 4: Conceptual example of the application of an aggregated PCT to a UDL and the three different distribution methods for treated acres.**

* 1. Scaling for Redundancy in the UDLs

Many UDLs overlap with each other, identifying a single location as multiple potential uses sites, causing the sum of the individual acres in the UDLs to be greater than the acres in the action area, and often greater than the 100% of the species range (or critical habitat). If each UDL was independent the sum of the UDLs would equal the action area. To account for this redundancy between use sites three different factors are applied to results for the individual UDLs; the composite factor, the agricultural factor and the non-agricultural factor.

In order to calculate the composite factor, an agricultural composite containing all agricultural UDLs and a non-agricultural composite containing all non-agricultural UDLs are generated. The composite factor is equal to the sum of the agricultural and non-agricultural composite divided by the action area. This factor accounts for the redundancy between the agricultural and non-agricultural uses. If all uses are independent the sum of the two composites would equal the action area, and the factor would be equal to 1. Each individual UDL is divided by this composite factor.

An agricultural factor is calculated by summing the results of all the agricultural UDLs and dividing by the agricultural composite. This factor is applied to all of the agricultural UDLs to account for the redundancy between agricultural UDLs. Similarly, a non-agricultural factor is calculated by summing the results of all the non-agricultural UDLs and dividing by the non-agricultural composite. This factor is applied to all of the non-agricultural UDLs to account for the redundancy between non-agricultural UDLs. If all uses are independent the sum of the individual UDLs would equal the composite, and the factor would be equal to 1.

After scaling the results to account for redundancy the sum of the individual UDLs will not exceed the action area percent overlap. Equations used in the calculation of these factors are shown below in **Equation 7-9.**

**Equation 7**.

**Equation 8**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i = | Agricultural UDLs |
| n= | Number of agricultural UDLs |
| j = | Agricultural composite layer |
| PO = | Unadjusted percent overlap |

**Equation 9**.

Where:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i = | Non-agricultural UDLs |
| n= | Number of non-agricultural UDLs |
| j = | Non-agricultural composite layer |
| PO = | Unadjusted percent overlap |

1. Results Co-occurrence Analysis – Examples Species for Glyphosate

The final results of the co-occurrence analysis provide the percent of the species range (or critical habitat) that overlaps with each UDL. This metric is provided for each of the overlap scenario. The mean percent overlap and standard deviation for the glyphosate UDLs across each overlap scenario for all ConUS species range are provided in Table 7. The final overlap scenario incorporating species life history related to habitat is presented in Table 9**.** Glyphosate’s action area had a mean overlap of 98%. The mean overlaps out to the limits of ground and aerial drift stayed at 98% due to minimal drift in the action area. A separate drift layer, not presented in these tables, was developed for consideration of the impacts of drift. The mean overlaps for the individual UDLs range from <1 to 98% before incorporating usage and species life history information. After incorporating this information, the range remains the same, <1 to 98% , but significant differences are observed in 21 of the 24 UDLs.

Table 8 presents the overlap for all ConUS designated critical habitats. For critical habitat, glyphosate’s action area had a mean overlap of 98%. Similar to the range result the mean overlaps out to the limits of ground and aerial drift increases only slight to 99% due to minimal drift in the action area. The mean overlaps for the individual UDLs range from <1 to 98% before incorporating usage. After incorporating this information, the range remains the same, <1 to 98%, but significant differences are observed in 17 of the 24 UDLs.

**Table 7. Mean percent overlap and standard deviation for ConUS species range and each glyphosate uses in the ConUS for each overlap scenario.**



| **Use** | **Overlap Scenario 1: Unadjusted (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 2: PCT Overlap (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 3:**  **PCT and Redundancy (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 4:**  **PCT, Redundancy, Off-site**  **(mean, std)** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Use | Mean | STD | Mean | STD | Mean | STD | Mean | STD |
| Glyphosate Action Area | 98 | 8 | 98 | 8 | 98 | 8 | 98 | 8 |
| Aquatic Herbicide | 98 | 8 | 64 | 36 | 64 | 36 | 61 | 36 |
| Bermuda Grass | 11 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| Citrus | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Corn | 3 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Cotton | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) | 8 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| Developed | 6 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Fallow | 8 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Forest Trees | 12 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Grapes | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.4 |
| Noncultivated | 90 | 14 | 90 | 14 | 57 | 17 | 48 | 25 |
| Nurseries | <1 | 0.05 | <1 | 0.05 | <1 | 0.02 | <1 | 0.02 |
| Open Space Developed | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Other Crops | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.4 |
| Other Grains | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Other Orchards | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Other Row Crops | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.3 | <1 | 1 |
| Pasture | 20 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| Rice | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.2 | <1 | 0.5 |
| Right of Way | 10 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Soybeans | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Vegetables and Ground Fruit | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.4 |
| Wheat | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Christmas Tree | <1 | 0.18 | <1 | 0.18 | <1 | 0.09 | <1 | 0.08 |
| Limit Ground Drift (300 m or 1000 ft) | 98 | 7 | 98 | 7 | 98 | 7 | 98 | 7 |
| Limit Aerial Drift (792m or 2600ft) | 98 | 6 | 98 | 6 | 98 | 6 | 98 | 6 |

**Table 8. Mean percent overlap and standard deviation for ConUS designated critical habitat and each glyphosate uses in the ConUS for each overlap scenarios.**


| **Use** | **Overlap Scenario 1: Unadjusted (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 2: PCT Overlap (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 3:**  **PCT and Redundancy (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 4:**  **PCT, Redundancy, Off-site**  **(mean, std)** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Use | Mean | STD | Mean | STD | Mean | STD | Mean | STD |
| Glyphosate Action Area | 98 | 8 | 98 | 8 | 98 | 8 | 98 | 8 |
| Aquatic Herbicide | 98 | 8 | 90 | 23 | 90 | 24 | 90 | 23 |
| Bermuda Grass | 8 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Citrus | <1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | <1 | 0.05 | <1 | 0.04 |
| Corn | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Cotton | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) | 5 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Developed | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Fallow | 5 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Forest Trees | 10 | 14 | 8 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| Grapes | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Noncultivated | 93 | 12 | 93 | 12 | 63 | 19 | 63 | 19 |
| Nurseries | <1 | 0.3 | <1 | 0.3 | <1 | 0.1 | <1 | 0.1 |
| Open Space Developed | 5 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Other Crops | 2 | 6 | 1 | 5 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Other Grains | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | <1 | 0.5 | <1 | 0.4 |
| Other Orchards | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Other Row Crops | <1 | 2 | <1 | 2 | <1 | 0.5 | <1 | 1 |
| Pasture | 20 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 |
| Rice | <1 | 0.5 | <1 | 0.2 | <1 | 0.04 | <1 | 0.04 |
| Right of Way | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Soybeans | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Vegetables and Ground Fruit | <1 | 2 | <1 | 2 | <1 | 0.5 | <1 | 0.4 |
| Wheat | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Christmas Tree | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.2 | <1 | 0.2 |
| Limit Ground Drift (300 m or 1000 ft) | 99 | 7 | 99 | 7 | 99 | 7 | 99 | 7 |
| Limit Aerial Drift (792m or 2600ft) | 99 | 6 | 99 | 6 | 99 | 6 | 99 | 6 |

Figure 5 and Figure 6 provide two species examples, the first is an example of a species with high impact to overlap from usage and the second example is a species with lower impact of usage on overlap. In these examples the dark gray is the extent of the glyphosate action area, which includes all potential use sites and drift. Due to the number and variety of uses for glyphosate the action area covers all area under US jurisdiction. The state images show the extent of the action area with example state treated acres for glyphosate highlighted in purple. The aggregated maximum PCT was used to calculate the state treated acres for this example.


For the example species in Figure 5, uniformly distributed treated acres for the states are highlighted in purple in the image on the left. The image on the right in Figure 5 presents the upper distribution of the treated acres for the species, moving all of the treated acres for the state into the species range. When considering just the direct overlap for the species example on the right, usage has reduced the extent overlap, when compared to the alternative assumption without usage data that 100% of the overlap is treated. Drift would be considered in conjunction with theses treated acres, the drift extent is not included on the map. The upper distribution of the maximum PCT for this species includes significant areas of the action area footprint in grey not captured by the treated area, depicting the impacts of usage.



 

**Figure 5. Example of a species with higher impact of usage for glyphosate; species Arroyo toad (*Anaxyrus californicus).***




For the species in Figure 6 example treated acres, across all uses, for the state when uniformly distributed are highlighted in purple in the map on top. The image to the bottom left of Figure 6 presents the upper distribution of the treated acres for the maximum PCT for the species, reaching the limit of overlap for this species. The action area within the species range is completely filled (i.e. 100 PCT). In this situation, the overlap for the upper distribution of the treated acres would be the same as overlap for the species without usage (i.e. 100 PCT), resulting in little impact of usage under this scenario. The image on the right in Figure 6 represents the uniform distribution of treated acres and does not reach the overlap limit for the species however, a number of acres still overlap with the species habitat. The overlap for uniform distribution would be less than the 100 PCT overlap assumed without usage.





**Figure 6. Example of a species with lower impact of usage for glyphosate; species** **Island marble Butterfly (*Euchloe ausonides insulanus)*.**



* 1. Suitable Habitat Overlap

In total suitable habitat was identified for 106 species that occur in the ConUS. Table 9 provides themean percent overlap and standard deviation for these 106 species with the same overlap metrics but limited to just the areas of suitable habitat. Both the suitable habitat results and the full range result account for usage and species life history. This information is considered with the results for the full species range as part of the Weight of Evidence. The mean overlaps for the individual UDLs range from <1 to 61% for the full species range and <1 to 35% when considering suitable habitat areas.

**Table 9. Mean percent overlap and standard deviation for uses in ConUS and suitable habitat species before and after limiting the overlap extent to suitable habitat.**

| **Use** | **Overlap Scenario 4: PCT, Redundancy, Off-site (mean, std)** | | **Overlap Scenario 5:**  **PCT, Redundancy, Off-site, Habitat (mean, std)** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Use | Mean | STD | Mean | STD |
| Glyphosate Action Area | 98 | 8 | <1 | 2 |
| Aquatic Herbicide | 61 | 36 | 35 | 25 |
| Bermuda Grass | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| Citrus | <1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Corn | 1 | 2 | <1 | 0.3 |
| Cotton | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.1 |
| Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Developed | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Fallow | 2 | 4 | <1 | 1 |
| Forest Trees | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Grapes | <1 | 0.4 | <1 | 0.02 |
| Noncultivated | 48 | 25 | 25 | 19 |
| Nurseries | <1 | 0.02 | <1 | 0.02 |
| Open Space Developed | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Other Crops | <1 | 0.4 | <1 | 0.5 |
| Other Grains | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.3 |
| Other Orchards | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.1 |
| Other Row Crops | <1 | 1 | <1 | 0.04 |
| Pasture | 8 | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| Rice | <1 | 0.5 | <1 | 0.004 |
| Right of Way | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Soybeans | 1 | 3 | <1 | 0.3 |
| Vegetables and Ground Fruit | <1 | 0.4 | <1 | 0.1 |
| Wheat | 1 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
| Christmas Tree | <1 | 0.08 | <1 | 0.04 |
| Limit Ground Drift (300 m or 1000 ft) | 98 | 7 | 22 | 25 |
| Limit Aerial Drift (792m or 2600ft) | 98 | 6 | 48 | 35 |

1. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/endangered-species/revised-method-national-level-listed-species-biological-evaluations-conventional> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. At the time when the potential use site data were compiled and the UDLs were developed, only the 2012 Census of Agriculture was available. Although the 2017 census data are now available, by the time the new census data were released, there were insufficient time to incorporate them into this biological evaluation. New data will be incorporated into future analyses if time allows. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/endangered-species/revised-method-national-level-listed-species-biological-evaluations-conventional> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Query used to extract species from TESS: https://ecos.fws.gov/services/TessQuery?request=query&xquery=/SPECIES\_DETAIL [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Statuses included: Threatened, Endangered, Experimental Population Non-Essential, Proposed Threatened, Proposed Endangered, and Candidate [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/endangered-species-conservation/esa-threatened-endangered-species> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Website for designated critical habitat: ([http://ecos.fws.gov/crithab)](http://ecos.fws.gov/crithab) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. <http://desktop.arcgis.com/en/arcmap/10.3/tools/analysis-toolbox/union.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. USFWS, personal communication, November 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. U.S. Geological Survey Gap Analysis Program, 20160513, GAP/LANDFIRE National Terrestrial Ecosystems 2011: U.S. Geological Survey: Boise, ID, http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/gaplandcover/. doi:10.5066/F7ZS2TM0. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)