Canada's Use of Buffer Zones for Risk Mitigation



Ted Kuchnicki, PhD

Environmental Assessment Directorate, Pest Management Regulatory Agency, Health Canada





 Agricultural buffer zone modification proposal

Sensitive habitat challenges



How to Mitigate Drift?

Buffer Zones
= No spray zones
= Setbacks

Distance between the point of direct application and the closest <u>downwind</u> edge of a sensitive terrestrial or aquatic habitat



Labelled Spray Drift Statement

 Aerial application: DO NOT apply during periods of dead calm. Avoid application of this product when winds are gusty. DO NOT apply when wind speed is greater than 16 km/h at flying height at the site of application. DO NOT apply with spray droplets smaller than the American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE) [fine/medium/coarse] classification. To reduce drift caused by turbulent wingtip vortices, the nozzle distribution along the spray boom length MUST NOT exceed 65% of the wing- or rotorspan



Buffer Zone Exemptions

 Use of the following spray methods or equipment DO NOT require a buffer zone: hand-held or backpack sprayer, spot treatment, inter-row hooded sprayer, soil drench and soil incorporation

Terrestrial buffer zones for:
 Forestry - conifer release, site preparation



Buffer Zone Exemptions

 Buffer zones for the protection of terrestrial habitats are not required for use on rights-of-way including railroad ballast, rail and hydro rights-of-way, utility easements, roads, and training grounds and firing ranges on military bases



Buffer Zone Exemptions

 For application to rights-of-way, buffer zones for protection of sensitive terrestrial habitats are not required; however, the best available application strategies which minimize off-site drift. including meteorological conditions (e.g., wind direction, low wind speed) and spray equipment (e.g., coarse droplet sizes, minimizing height above canopy), should be used. Applicators must, however, observe the specified buffer zones for February 2008

Current Buffer Zone Approach

Conservative

No flexibility based on:

- Adjacent sensitive habitat
- Application conditions

 Doesn't 'credit' drift reducing technologies



Agricultural Buffer Zone Modification Strategy

Application Specific Buffer Zones

- Provide flexibility
- Recognize different habitats
 - Reward efficient application
- Remain environmentally protective



Agricultural Buffer Zone Modification Strategy

- Buffer zone reduction factors (modifiers, multipliers)
- Applicator-adjusted buffer zones based on:
 - Sensitive habitat impacted
 - Application variables
 - Meteorology
 - Equipment

 Product - and application - specific buffer zones February 2008



Application Variables

- Droplet size
- Wind speed
- Atmospheric stability
- Discharge height and direction
- Temperature and relative humidity
- Travel speed
- Shrouds and cones
- Adjuvants
- Crop canopy



Application Variables

- Variable chose:
 - Largest effect on drift
 - More easily implemented
 - Safety to applicator



Field Application Variables

- Boom height
 Low High (60 cm)
- Spray quality (DSD)
 Fine Medium Coarse
- Wind speed
 3 Categories
- Shrouds and cones



Low Boom A	Application	Modifiers
Low Boom	pproduction	mountero

Label Spray Advisory – Fine				
Wind Speed	Spray Quality			
(km/h)	Fine	Medium	Coarse	
1-8	0.5	0.1	0.1	
9-16	0.7	0.4	0.2	
17-25	1.0	0.6	0.4	
Label Spray Advisory – Medium				
Wind Speed (km/h)	Spray Quality			
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	
1-8	0.8	0.2	0.1	
9-16		0.6	0.3	
17-25		1.0	0.6	
Label Spray Advisory – Coarse				
Wind Speed	Spray Quality			
(km/h)	Fine	Medium	Coarse	
1-8		0.4	0.1	
9-16		0.9	0.5	
17-25			1.0	



Modifications

Field sprayer application:

Spray boom fitted with a full shield (shroud, curtain) that extends to the crop canopy, the labelled buffer zone can be reduced by 70%

Spray boom where individual nozzles are fitted with cone-shaped shields that are no more than 30 cm above the crop canopy, the labelled buffer zone can be reduced by 30%



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy

- Comments received from
 - Registrants
 - Grower groups
 - Applicators
 - Provincial departments
- Over 100 unique comments



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy

Risk Assessment

- General 6
- Habitats 10

Buffer Zones

- General 17
- Barriers to crop protection 6
- Human habitation 5
- Exclusions 18



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy

BZ Modification Strategy

- General 17
- Modifiers 17
- Complexity 9
- Wind speed 10
- Training 6
- Record keeping 6
- Water multipliers 5
- BMP booklet 5
- Implementation 4



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy General

- Why are buffer zones required?
- Buffer zones should be reflective of the real world; buffer zones are too conservative
- Buffer zones should be guidelines not a label requirement
- Not harmonized with US approach



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy Sensitive Habitats

- Definitions of sensitive habitats too broad
- Buffer zone may not be applicable due to absence of most sensitive species
 - Ten crop terrestrial species used to calculated buffer zones should be replaced by indigenous species
- Sensitive habitats are sources of pest inoculum, e.g. invasive species



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy Barriers to Crop Production

 Sensitive habitats may be barriers to farming and may be removed

 Farmers should manage sensitive habitats on a case-by-case basis

 Buffer zones result in loss of cultivable land or non-treated areas

 Buffer zones prevent use of perimeter sprays (IPM)



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy Exclusions

- Artificial ponds
- Self-contained water bodies
- Windbreaks
- Wetlands created by landowners
- Terrestrial areas planted by farmers
- Should exclude vegetation planted:
 - to protect sensitive aquatic areas
 - to reduce off-site drift



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy Modifiers

- Need modifiers for:
 - drift reduction agents
 - low drift nozzles
 - air assist nozzles
 - boom height
 - stage of crop growth
- Should consider temperature and humidity as modification factors for aerial application



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy Complexity

- Strategy is complex and restrictive and time consuming
- Numerous calculations must be carried out and for each application
- Complex calculations, should develop software program
- Should use The Netherlands approach as starting point as it is simpler



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy Training

- Education and training is important and should be undertaken before the proposal is implemented
- PMRA should produce training tools
- PMRA regional officers should train key stakeholders
- Agricultural stakeholders should deliver training
- Current training material out of date
- Speed at which training material can be updated may be problematic



Comments on PMRA BZ Strategy BMP Booklet

- Should include graphical information on how to measure buffer zone
- Should have a detailed list, including pictures, of sensitive habitats
- Supportive of updating guidance booklet as new technology developed
- Detailed guidance in BMP for measuring wind speed
- Guidance document needs to be simple and easy to use for farmers



Sensitive Habitat

 Area containing /comprised of organisms affected by pesticide

Aquatic – permanent or seasonal
 temporary not considered sensitive





Sensitive Habitat

Sensitive terrestrial habitats:

grasslands, forested areas, shelter belts, woodlots, hedgerows, riparian areas and shrublands

Sensitive aquatic habitats:

 lakes, rivers, sloughs, ponds, prairie potholes, creeks, marshes, streams, reservoirs, wetlands and estuarine /marine habitats



Non-Habitat Area

 Cropland, pasture, rangeland, areas adjacent to right of way

Ditch

Managed area ?

PMRA ARLA

Terrestrial Habitats Issues

Buffer zones too large

Can be larger than field

Loss of treated acreage
 Solution - elimination of habitats by growers

Shelterbelts

In-field "habitats" – how do you buffer?



Terrestrial Habitats Issues

- Invasive weeds adjacent to treated fields
 - Do BZs apply in all situations?
 - Federal vs Provincial jurisdictions
 - Do BZs cause damage in long-term?

What are we really trying to protect?



- Current risk assessment:
 - Based on 10 crop plants
 - Juvenile plants
 - Non-lethal measurement endpoint
 - Dry wt., shoot height
 - EC₂₅
 - Based on potential for recovery at later stages of growth
 - Most sensitive species



Modify the risk assessment?

 Registrants claim crops are nearly always more sensitive than weeds

Where are the data?

 OECD Annex 3 list of non-crop species
 52 non-crop



Effects on fully-grown plants

Species sensitivity distribution
 HD₅ of LC₅₀

Native species vs Non-native species (invasive)
Ecological function?



Ecological basis for size of habitats
 Areas <1-2 ha – may not be highly functional for wildlife



Habitats

 Workshop on Identification of Sensitive Habitats

- April 2008
- Fall 2008

 Assist PMRA in identifying habitats which should be protected



Canada's Use of Buffer Zones for Risk Mitigation



Ted Kuchnicki, PhD

Environmental Assessment Directorate Pest Management Regulatory Agency

