



# Frontline

## *Forestry Research Applications*

Canadian Forest Service - Sault Ste. Marie

Technical Note No. 112

## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) On the Use of Herbicides in Canadian Forestry

D.G. Thompson, D.G. Pitt

### Introduction

Forest herbicide application is an important silvicultural tool in the regeneration of Canada's forests. Currently in Ontario, herbicides are applied to approximately 70,000 ha annually, about one third of the area regenerated each year. The Canadian forest industry relies on the use of herbicides as an effective plantation management technique to ensure forest renewal and to remain competitive. However, the concerned public has questioned the safety of herbicide use, prompting Canadian Forest Service (CFS) scientists to use their in-depth knowledge to answer to a number of key questions posed by members of the public.

The focus of this FAQ document is on the use of herbicides and the potential risks, particularly to wildlife, that may be associated with their use. This information has been presented to citizens' groups across Ontario in recent years and has been refined based on feedback received. The objective of this document is to present the scientific facts about herbicide use in forest management and thus better inform discussions related to forest vegetation management techniques. Comprehensive review of this topic is beyond the scope of this article. However, an extensive list of scientific articles is referenced for those who wish to read further on a particular question and readers are directed to general reviews (1, 2) for broader contextual information.

### 1. Are herbicides harmful to humans and wildlife?

In considering the potential direct effects of any chemical on any biological organism, it is necessary to take into account three fundamental principles of toxicology:

1. all chemicals are toxic (e.g., herbicides, caffeine, alcohol, acetylsalicylic acid [ASA], nicotine, sodium chloride [table salt]), but some are more toxic than others;
2. the degree to which a toxicological effect is expressed depends on exposure or dose, both in terms of the actual amount and the time frame over which it occurs (as an analogy, think of the difference in effect resulting from consuming several glasses of alcohol in say an hour, versus the same amount over an entire

day or a smaller amount and frequency of occurrence such as an occasional glass of wine with dinner);

3. in simple terms, if there is no exposure, there can be no dose, and therefore no effect.

In a manner similar to the human consumption of alcohol noted above, the potential effects of a herbicide on either humans or any wildlife species depends on the magnitude, duration, frequency and route of exposure. Just as there are levels of alcohol or caffeine that may be consumed without any noticeable or measurable effect, there are levels of exposure for wildlife or humans to herbicides for which we cannot observe or measure a direct or indirect deleterious effect.

Best management practices are designed and used such that application rates, techniques and mitigation strategies (e.g., buffer zones) to ensure a high probability that exposure levels for wildlife species are below toxicological effect thresholds while at the same time sufficient to achieve silvicultural objectives.

### 2. Why is it necessary to control competing vegetation following harvesting in forestry?

Following harvest, numerous pioneer plant species (e.g., Canada blue-joint grass, raspberry, trembling aspen), which are well-adapted to disturbed sites and open growing conditions, easily outcompete newly planted crop tree seedlings (e.g., spruce and pine species) for nutrients, light, water and growing space (3). Similar to what happens in the home garden, reduced crop growth or outright crop failure will occur if weeds are not controlled effectively. Of course in contrast to the home garden, the scale at which forestry operations occur makes hand-weeding highly impractical.

**3. Instead of intervening to control competing vegetation, why not simply leave harvested sites to regenerate naturally?** On many sites, that is in fact what is done. For example, ~36 % of the forest area harvested annually in Canada is allowed to regenerate naturally (4). In Ontario, even when the use of artificial regeneration was at its peak

in the early 1990s, only half of the cutover area was planted or direct seeded and the rest was left to regenerate naturally (5). In Ontario, from 2001–2005, the area of Crown forest regenerated ranged from 180,381 to 240,435 hectares per year but only 32.6 to 38.4% of the area received a chemical tending treatment (6). Professional foresters know that natural regeneration of conifers cannot be applied on all site types. In many cases (with the notable exception of winter-harvested lowland black spruce), natural regeneration is often not effective on cutover sites > 10 ha (i.e., much smaller than the typical scale of operational cut block areas). As a direct result of ineffective regeneration (both natural and artificial), there has been a substantial loss of conifer-dominated stands on the landscape.

Artificially regenerated stands of jack pine and black and white spruce were surveyed 10–15 years after being planted; 20% of the trees failed to reach free-to-grow status (7, 8). In stands planted with red and white pine, even greater proportions of the trees did not reach free-to-grow status. These conifer species were reportedly always replaced by balsam fir and hardwood species such as poplars and birches (9). The loss of pine and spruce dominated stands across the landscape was further verified in a subsequent independent audit (10) and continues to be recognized as a major challenge for the forest sector.



A typical herbicide treated forest regeneration site in Alberta.

**4. Why do foresters use herbicides instead of other, non-chemical, alternatives?** As a simplifying generalization, there are no alternatives that are as cost-effective, efficient or reliable as modern chemical herbicides in many forest regeneration scenarios. However, non-chemical techniques are employed on a large portion of the forest land base. For example, in the province of Ontario, approximately two-thirds of the forest area harvested annually is regenerated using non-chemical techniques (4). Non-chemical methods may involve planned natural regeneration, mechanical site preparation, brush saw, prescribed fire, controlling the season of harvest to reduce aspen sprouting (11), matching the silvicultural system to the species (e.g., using shelterwood for white pine to retain shade), careful site selection (e.g., planting on less competitive sites), or a combination of such methods, depending upon site specific prescriptions (2).

**5. Given that herbicide use is largely on conifer plantations in northern regions, what would happen if herbicide use on those sites was prohibited or discontinued?** This depends upon a wide range of crop, site, soil and competing vegetation variables. However, without the aid of chemical herbicides there is a high probability

that many plantations would fail to regenerate to conifer-dominated stands within the time required to meet sustainability requirements. Ultimately, this would lead to significant new additions to the deficit of conifer-dominated stand types already existing on the on the landscape.

A detailed audit recently conducted on regeneration sites in Nova Scotia, where a decision was taken not to use herbicides, provides good evidence of the probable outcomes. In this case, results showed 87% of the conifer plantations as outright failures, with an additional 10% that did not meet free-to-grow standards 6–8 years post-harvest (12). We must emphasize that the impact of such decisions may not be clearly evident until several years after they are made. Similar outcomes have been observed in research trials conducted in other forest ecosystems (13, 14).

**6. Have scientists really made a legitimate effort to seek out and test non-chemical alternatives to herbicides?** Yes. Federal and provincial government scientists and academics across the country, have expended a tremendous amount of time and energy (not to mention your tax dollars) seeking to discover, investigate and develop non-chemical alternatives that would be effective in Canadian forestry scenarios. These efforts have focused on everything from natural regeneration and mulch mats, through biocontrols to using grazing livestock. The Vegetation Management Alternatives Program established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) in the early 1990s is an excellent example of the effort. Unfortunately, while some of these techniques have potential for application under very specific conditions (3) none match modern herbicides, such as glyphosate, in terms of general utility, effectiveness, reliability, low cost and documented environmental acceptability.

As an example, a national effort was undertaken to develop and register the indigenous (native) fungus *Chondrostereum purpureum* (15–17) as a microbial biocontrol agent for forest vegetation management. Results of nationally coordinated trials showed it to be highly effective in controlling re-sprouting of some woody competitive species. Two derivative commercial products were ultimately registered for use. However, use of these products has been minimal in operational forest practice for several reasons, including: 1) total lack of efficacy on herbaceous competitor species; 2) ineffectiveness on some particular woody species; and 3) the need for manual or mechanical cutting immediately prior to application of the fungus, which increases overall operational costs. Other alternative approaches, such as the use of mulch mats have also generally proven to be both ineffective and far too costly (18, 19) for widespread use in operational forestry.

**7. Even if alternatives are more costly and maybe don't work as well as herbicides, wouldn't it still be better to use them because they are safer?** Not necessarily. All options carry some inherent degree of risk either to environmental or human health. The actual risks for other options are relatively less well-studied and defined, which is not necessarily a good thing. Risks of other potentially deleterious effects are technique specific. For example, mechanical site preparation with large machinery carries risks associated with harm to wildlife, potential soil compaction, increased erosion and excessive burning of fossil fuels. Manual clearing with brush saws involves unequivocal risk to workers associated with repetitive direct exposure to proven carcinogens such as benzene in exhaust fumes, as well as demonstrable risks for stress and strain type injuries. Prescribed fire also has risks associated with the safety of workers and the possibility that the fire will escape.

With herbicide use, risks are generally associated with the potential for direct or indirect effects on wildlife species or to humans that

may be inadvertently exposed to herbicide residues. However, such risks are significantly mitigated by the extensive scientific research that is invoked to enhance our understanding and define biological effects thresholds and the operational practices that are put into place to reduce the probability that actual exposures will exceed such thresholds (e.g., buffer zones, signage, use of minimum effective rates, advanced application technologies to optimize targeting and reduce drift potential).

There are important differences between scientifically quantifiable risk or probability of occurrence, and the willingness of an individual or particular segment of society to tolerate those risks and probabilities. Risk tolerance varies dramatically from one segment of society to another and often directly reflects familiarity and knowledge (20).

**8. Who is responsible for ensuring that herbicides used in Canadian forestry do not pose significant risks to human or environmental health?** Primary responsibility lies with the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) of Health Canada, which reviews and regulates all pesticide use in this country under the federal Pest Control Products Act. Registration of control products indicates that, based on extensive expert review of all available scientific evidence, these products have no potential for significant effects on human or environmental health when used in accordance with specifications provided on the label. Information on registered products is available from the PMRA website (<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/index-eng.php>). Additional agencies in each Canadian province, such as the Ministry of Environment and the MNR in Ontario, impose significant additional review, regulation and operational management requirements on the use of herbicides in forestry under a variety of different provincial legislative acts (e.g., Ontario Pesticides Act).

**9. How are the scientific data on herbicide effects on environmental or human health generated?** The bulk of the data used in the initial regulatory review and registration of an herbicide is provided by the registrant (typically the manufacturer). This data may be generated within their own research laboratories or by third-party, independently certified laboratories. Much additional scientific research is conducted by independent academic, federal and provincial government scientists across Canada who work under the specific mandate of conducting research in the public good. This work often focuses on field studies to determine the behaviour and potential effects of herbicides under the specific conditions of Canadian forest use or to address specific public concerns (e.g., potential effects on amphibians, or the effectiveness of buffer zones as a risk mitigation technique).

**10. How many herbicides are registered for use in Canadian forestry?** There are five herbicide active ingredients registered for use in Canadian forestry (2,4-D, hexazinone, simazine, triclopyr and glyphosate). In Canadian forestry, glyphosate has accounted for more than 93% of the forest area treated for more than a decade. Uses of other herbicides, particularly in recent years, are sufficiently minor that they do not warrant further discussion here. However, detailed statistics on pesticide use in Canadian forestry are freely available through the National Forestry Database Program website (<http://nfdp.ccfm.org/>). Since the patent has expired on glyphosate, several manufacturers now produce various end-use formulations of this compound and they are sold in the forest market under trade names such as Vision, VisionMax, Forza and Vantage. While all of these formulated products contain glyphosate as the active ingredient and a surfactant to enhance uptake across plant cuticles, the actual chemical constitution of each formulation may vary (i.e., one formulated glyphosate product does not necessarily equal another).

**11. Where can I find the actual toxicological and environmental fate data available for specific herbicides used in Canada?** Detailed information on the general toxicological and environmental fate of herbicides can be easily found by using keywords to search the Pesticide Information Profile (PIPs) section of the EXTTOXNET website (<http://exttoxnet.orst.edu/>), which is maintained by a consortium of universities in the USA. Regulatory review and decision documents pertinent to any herbicide used in Canada can be found by searching the PMRA website.

**12. What is the typical use pattern for glyphosate-based products?** Herbicides are applied under two different strategies, either prior to planting (chemical site preparation) or after seedlings are planted (tending or release). Owing to the remoteness and difficult access characteristic of many treatment sites, and the cost-effectiveness of the technique, aerial application using either fixed-wing or rotary wing aircraft, is the most common method of applying herbicides to target sites. Typically herbicides are applied within the first five years post-harvest and any given site receives one or maximally two treatments in a rotation period of 50-80 years depending upon crop species and site quality. In Ontario, which has historically treated the most forest area of any province on an annual basis, ~ 70,000 ha are treated each year, an area essentially equal to the area planted. This equates to approximately one-third of the area harvested annually or about 0.28% of the total productive forest land base in the province. The typical use rate for glyphosate in conifer release programs in Ontario is 1.9 kg /ha (21). A provincial ban on herbicide use in forests was invoked in the province of Quebec in 2001. In contrast the use of glyphosate in the province of Alberta has been increasing, largely as the result of stringent new requirements to meet “free-to-grow” standards and sustainable use goals.

**13. Doesn't aerial application of glyphosate pose a high risk of drift and contamination of environmentally sensitive non-target areas such as streams, ponds or lakes?** No. While such risks do exist, the combination of professional aerial applicator training and licensing, modern application technologies such as low drift nozzles and electronic guidance systems and the legislative requirement for buffer zones mitigates these risks to very low levels. A recent study investigating the advantages of modern aerial application technologies concluded that under typical aerial application scenarios in Ontario, toxicologically significant deposits of glyphosate are very unlikely to occur at any distance beyond ~ 30 to 50 m from target zone boundaries, thus confirming the protective value of the 60 or 120 meter buffers imposed to protect various aquatic ecosystems (22). A previous study (21) monitoring numerous aerial spray operations across Ontario, demonstrated that water-bodies next to aerially treated sites and protected by standing timber buffers do not contain glyphosate residues in the water at concentrations above known toxicological significance thresholds.

**14. How does glyphosate kill plants?** Glyphosate is a nonselective herbicide that moves systemically throughout plants once it has penetrated the waxy leaf cuticle. However, because it is highly water soluble, it doesn't penetrate waxy cuticles well at all and requires the use of a surfactant (a detergent) to enhance transfer across this protective barrier. Once inside of the plant, glyphosate kills plants by inhibiting a very specific enzyme by which plants synthesize amino acids.

Glyphosate is also very strongly bound to organic matter and clay particles in soils. It is therefore essentially deactivated by soils and has no ability to control plants sprouting from seeds in the soil seed bank or from roots or rhizomes of untreated plants.

**15. Why is glyphosate such a dominant herbicide in Canadian forestry?** There are three key reasons: a) its excellent record of efficacy and reliability in controlling most competitive species including those that resprout through rhizomes, root or basal buds; b) its relatively favourable environmental behaviour profile (e.g., non-persistent in soils, vegetation and water, does not accumulate in animals, has very low potential to leach into ground water); and c) its relatively low innate toxicity to humans and wildlife. For many of these same reasons glyphosate is a dominant herbicide used in both forestry and agriculture internationally. Glyphosate does not easily kill conifers, particularly after they have had a chance to fully develop waxy cuticle on their needles. The cuticular wax is sufficiently thick to protect the needles from disease, dehydration and the effects of glyphosate at doses sufficient to injure the tree. Thus glyphosate is particularly effective at control competing vegetation in plantations of conifer trees, which are the dominant commercial tree species harvested throughout the boreal region in Canada.

**16. What about potential effects of glyphosate-based herbicides on humans?** Based on regulatory risk assessments conducted by the PMRA and several other international reviews, the use of glyphosate



Chemical and biological monitoring to detect potential herbicide effects on amphibians.

based herbicides applied in accordance with the specific product labels does not pose a significant risk to either applicators or others who might be inadvertently exposed. All of the fundamental principles of toxicology described above apply, and in particular the key point that no exposure means no dose and therefore no effect.

Individuals directly involved in the herbicide application (e.g., mixer/loaders, pilots, those applying herbicide by backpack) have the greatest probability, magnitude and frequency of potential exposures and therefore the highest potential risk. For this reason, all applicators must be specifically trained and licensed in the safe handling and application of pesticides and all are required to wear appropriate personal protective equipment (e.g., goggles, chemically resistant gloves, long-sleeved shirts etc.), as identified on the product label. The express intent of these precautions is to minimize their exposure to essentially nil. Modern equipment and technology used to mix and load herbicides into spray aircraft are also specifically designed to minimize any potential human exposure. Finally, glyphosate itself is poorly absorbed via dermal penetration through skin tissues (23) or across membranes in the digestive tract, which inherently limits the potential dose to other critical body organs and tissues. Lab studies

that involve direct application to such organs or tissues and which do not account for this aspect are therefore irrelevant in terms of real-world toxicological risk estimation.

**17. What practices are employed to minimize the potential for accidental exposure of other individuals who may be in the area?**

First, it should be recognized that given the small proportion of the total forest area treated in any given year, the low frequency of treatments to any given site, the relatively short time window (say six weeks during August to mid September) when applications are made, and the typical remote and difficult to access characteristics of most treatment sites, there is an exceedingly low probability of direct exposure for individuals other than those directly involved in the spray operation. Nonetheless, numerous protective measures are taken in all provinces to further protect against any potential accidental exposures. For example in the province of Ontario the Ministry of Natural Resources and Sustainable Forest License holders take the following specific actions:

- a) mapping and establishing no spray buffers around trappers' cabins and any other areas of human habitation during the planning process;
- b) the MNR district manager issues public notices detailing herbicide spray programs at least 30 days before the anticipated date of application and again 7 days prior to start, normally in the form of advertisements in the local media;
- c) direct written notice is provided by the MNR to landowners or occupants within one kilometre of the proposed treatment area;



Loading a spray aircraft with modern leak-proof systems and appropriate personal protective equipment.

d) all treatment sites are posted in multiple languages at access points for a minimum of 7 days in advance of treatment and at least 30 days subsequent thereto. These postings specifically advise people not to eat berries from the treated site until the following year; note that the extended "wait period" does not necessarily reflect a high level of risk, but rather is invoked as a simple extra precaution with no substantial down-side;

e) during the actual period of treatment, access roads to the mixing/loading location or specific sites being treated may be temporarily blocked; and

f) ground or aerial reconnaissance is conducted immediately prior to application to each individual site to ensure that no individuals are inadvertently within the treated sites scheduled to be sprayed.

**18. What mechanisms are used to enhance public awareness about local herbicide use in forestry or to allow them to voice their specific concerns?** Such mechanisms may vary from province to province. In Ontario, all management activities on Crown forests are subject to the Class Environmental Assessment for Timber Management (Class EA), which includes provisions for citizens or stakeholders to be involved in the forest management process. The planning phase identifies where, when and why herbicides might be used to control competing vegetation and these plans are available at any time for public review. To further enhance awareness of forest management activities, local citizens' committees (LCC) have been established in each district. The LCCs provide a good mechanism for the general public to raise specific issues or concerns and have them addressed. Representatives of the MNR or local Sustainable Forest License holders attend committee meetings and may address these concerns directly, or may bring in others to address highly technical questions in more detail. Both provincial and federal government researchers have made numerous presentations relating to various aspects of herbicide use to many different LCCs throughout the province.

**19. I've read on the internet that glyphosate causes cancer and is an endocrine disruptor, is that true?** No. Based on the weight of available scientific evidence, several regulatory and independent scientific review panels conclude that glyphosate is non-carcinogenic, does not cause birth defects or genetic alterations, and does not act as an endocrine disruptor in whole animal systems under realistic exposure regimes (24, 25). Such reviews conducted by highly qualified professional toxicologists and risk assessment specialists provide the most credible and reliable sources of information. There is a sharp contrast between these professional reviews and poorly or completely unsubstantiated misinformation that unfortunately is often widely circulated, intentionally or unintentionally, via the internet. Several examples of this problem involving individual laboratory studies being used inappropriately to support the contention of such risks, while professional toxicologists examining the same data provide clear and convincing evidence refuting such claims.

**20. What is known about the fate and behaviour of glyphosate, specifically in Canadian forest ecosystems?** Numerous laboratory studies confirm that glyphosate is highly water soluble but strongly bound to organic materials due to its ionic character, that it is rapidly and easily degraded by microorganisms such as bacteria and that it is not susceptible to bioaccumulation in the food chain. In addition, a substantial amount of scientific research has been undertaken directly in Canadian forest ecosystems to enhance our understanding of glyphosate fate and behaviour under conditions typical of use in this sector and to provide quantitative data that are used in environmental risk assessments. Very briefly, these data show that following typical aerial application, the majority of the spray cloud is deposited directly within the target area and specifically within the target vegetation canopy where it is intended to fall. In typical forestry applications, most of the herbicide will never reach the forest floor because it has been intercepted by the foliage of the competing plants it is intended to control. Thereafter glyphosate is rapidly taken up and translocated throughout the target competing vegetation with an estimated time for 50% dissipation (DT50) of foliar residues of ~ 2 days.

Other studies show that glyphosate is rapidly degraded, principally by microbial organisms and is therefore non-persistent in soil or water (time for the chemical to degrade by half ranges from a few days to a few weeks depending upon the specific environmental conditions involved) (26-34). Glyphosate is also strongly sorbed to organic carbon and clay particles and thus is not susceptible to leaching

downward into groundwater or lateral movement with surface water (28, 29, 32).

**21. What about the potential effects of glyphosate on wildlife?** A wealth of scientific information exists on the potential effects of glyphosate on a wide variety of wildlife species including birds, small mammals, large mammals, amphibians, insects, microbial organisms and others. Many scientific and regulatory reviews have examined available data on the effects of glyphosate on wildlife. All of these consistently conclude that the use of glyphosate products in accordance with product labels does not pose a significant risk to wildlife species in terms of either direct acute or chronic toxicity or through various potential sub-chronic or indirect effects. Numerous field studies on this topic have been undertaken in Canadian forest ecosystems and in general indicate that typical uses of formulated glyphosate products in forestry do not: a) generate plant monocultures (single-species forest plantations) on the treated sites; b) result in direct acute toxicity to birds, fish, aquatic invertebrates, small mammals, large mammals or amphibians; or c) cause reduction in soil microbial populations or significantly impair their function. Short-term reductions in numbers of some wildlife species (e.g., small mammals or birds) are known to occur in some cases (35, 36), as an indirect result of changes in their optimal vegetative habitat. Such changes are typically quite transient, with numbers returning to normal levels within 2-3 years as vegetation and preferred habitat or food re-establishes on the treated site.

Similar scenarios may occur with large mammal species (e.g., moose, deer) which may avoid treated sites for a few years post-treatment while the supply of their favoured browse species is reduced but then seek out those sites preferentially in later years when their browse species re-establishes on the site (37, 38)

**22. I've seen scientific studies that indicate that the surfactant used in glyphosate formulations kills frogs, is that true?** Yes and no. Let us recall the fundamental principles of toxicology, all compounds are toxic, some more so than others and it's really all a matter of dose or exposure. All forest-use applications of glyphosate involve the use of a surfactant either already incorporated in the end-use formulation or tank-mixed with it. The surfactant enhances uptake of glyphosate across the waxy cuticle of plants. For glyphosate formulations that contain the POEA surfactant (e.g., Vision and others) it is commonly accepted that it is the POEA surfactant which is the primary toxicant for aquatic organisms like fish and amphibians (tadpoles) rather than glyphosate itself.

Lab studies have shown that amphibians, particularly their aquatic larvae or the tadpole stages, are highly sensitive to glyphosate formulations containing the surfactant POEA, a detergent similar to others used in cosmetics and household products. In fact the role of the POEA surfactant in toxicity to both larval fish and amphibians has been established from laboratory studies for quite some time. However, to date all the available information indicates that toxic effects on amphibians that are demonstrated in lab experiments only occur at exposure levels well above exposure levels observed in wetlands or stream environments typical of real world amphibian breeding habitat; this is true in both the agriculture and forest sector. In fact, both manipulative and operational field studies conducted in Northern Ontario show no direct toxic effects, growth impairment or abnormal behaviour response for various species of amphibians at environmentally realistic exposures (21, 26).

Further research on the possible effects on amphibians is ongoing, but is now focused primarily on investigating the potential for subtle indirect effects on wetland habitat quality and potential interactive

effects with other types of stressors, because these potential effects are widely considered to be more plausible in the real world than are direct acute toxic effects.

**23. I read on the internet that glyphosate may be contaminating game meat and therefore there is substantial risk to First Nations peoples and other hunters who consume wild game, is that true?**

There are no credible scientific data supporting the contention that glyphosate residues may contaminate wild game tissues, particularly at levels that may be toxicologically significant to humans. Based on laboratory studies, glyphosate is known to be rapidly excreted in the urine and feces of experimental animals even when they are exposed at very high experimental dose levels and it has not been shown to accumulate in organ or muscle tissues following exposure at realistic levels. Field studies conducted in different forestry scenarios (31, 37, 39) confirm that glyphosate residues are not accumulated in the flesh of game animals (e.g., moose, deer, hare) or other wildlife species taken from within or near glyphosate treated areas.

**24. If the available scientific data demonstrate that the use of glyphosate or other pesticides does not pose any risk to the environment or human health, why are there bans such as that against herbicide use in forestry in Quebec, or the on the use of “cosmetic” pesticides in Ontario?**

It is important to recognize that decisions to “ban” pesticides are not necessarily based on pure science. Bans occur in some jurisdictions and not others, even though the same scientific information is available to both. While Quebec has chosen to ban the use of forest herbicides, most other provinces in Canada including Ontario, British Columbia, and New Brunswick use herbicides (particularly glyphosate) to ensure effective and efficient regeneration, which in turn contributes to overall sustainable forest management. Forest herbicides are used to meet very specific silvicultural objectives and cannot in any way be conceived as “cosmetic” and as such, are specifically excluded from the ban on “cosmetic” pesticides in Ontario. The provincial ban on cosmetic pesticides in Ontario was invoked in part to supersede a diverse set of bylaws that were being implemented by various municipalities and provide a singular, clearer set of rules.

**25. Is it true that herbicides cannot be used in forests certified by independent third party agencies, such as that of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)?**

No. Such certification systems are intended to ensure that the certified forests are managed sustainably, which requires effective and efficient regeneration. In fact, several major forests in Canada, including one of the largest in Ontario, which have held FSC certification for some time, continue to have herbicides such as glyphosate applied to them to meet regeneration and sustainability requirements. It is true that FSC seeks to reduce over-reliance on herbicides and requires forest managers to show evidence of seeking or using non-chemical alternatives as well as other approaches in an attempt to reduce herbicide use over the longer term.

## Literature Cited

1. Thompson, D.G.; Pitt, D.G. 2003. A review of Canadian forest vegetation management research and practice. *Annals of Forest Science* 60:559-72.
2. Wagner, R.G.; Colombo, S.J. editors. 2001. *Regenerating the Canadian Forest - Principles and practice for Ontario*. Fitzhenry & Whiteside, Markham, ON 650 p.
3. Wagner, R.G.; Bell, F.W.; Campbell, R.A. 2001. Vegetation management. Pages 431-457 In: R.G. Wagner and S.J. Colombo eds. *Regenerating the Canadian Forest: Principles and practice for Ontario*. Fitzhenry & Whiteside, Markham, ON.

4. Canadian Council of Forest Ministers. 2009. National Forest Database Program. CCFM, <http://nfdp.ccfm.org/> (accessed June 23, 2009).
5. Groot, A.; Jeglum, J.K.; Brown, W. 2001. Natural regeneration of conifers. Pages 375-392 In: R.G. Wagner and S.J. Colombo, eds. *Regenerating the Canadian forest - principles and practice for Ontario*. Fitzhenry & Whiteside Ltd., Markham, ON.
6. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 2008. Annual report on forest management 2005/2006. Queen's Printer for Ontario.
7. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 1986. Survey of artificial regeneration in northern Ontario: Summary report for Northwestern, North Central and Northern Regions, based on field sampling, 1984-1986. Ministry of Natural Resources files (cited by Armson et al. 2001).
8. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 1988. Survey of artificial regeneration in northern Ontario: Summary report for Northeastern and Algonquin regions, based on field sampling, 1987-1988. Ministry of Natural Resources files (cited by Armson et al. 2001)
9. Armson, K.A.; Grinnell, W.R.; Robinson, F.C. 2001. History of reforestation in Ontario. Pages 3-22 In: R.G. Wagner and S.J. Colombo, eds. *Regenerating the Canadian Forest: Principles and Practice for Ontario*. Fitzhenry & Whiteside, Markham, ON.
10. Hearnden, K.W.; Millson, S.C.; Wilson, W.C. 1992. A report on the status of forest regeneration. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Independent Forest Audit Committee, Sault Ste. Marie, ON, 117 p.
11. Myketa, D.; Polhill, B.; Whaley, R. 1998. Harvesting practices and their implications for vegetation management. Northwest Sci & Info Technical Note TN-43. Pages 1-10 In: F.W. Bell, M. McLaughlan and J. Kerley (compilers). *Vegetation management alternatives - A guide to opportunities*. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Thunder Bay, ON.
12. Nicholson, J. 2007. Survey of plantations established between 1998-2000 (6-8 years of age) on eastern Crown land without herbicides.: Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources, Forest Management Planning, Forest Research Report 83, 27 p.
13. Biring, B.S.; Comeau, P.G.; Fielder, P. 2003. Long-term effects of vegetation control treatments for release of Engelmann spruce from a mixed-shrub community in Southern British Columbia. *Annals of Forest Science* 60(7):681-690.
14. Dampier, J.E.E.; Bell, F.W.; St-Armour, M.; Pitt, D.G.; Luckai, N. 2006. Cutting versus herbicides: Tenth-year volume and release cost-effectiveness of sub-boreal conifer plantations. *Forestry Chronicle* 82(4):521-528.
15. Thompson, D.G.; Watson, A.K.; Dorworth, C.; Dumas, M.; Strunz, G.; Jobidon, R.; Harris, P.; Castellok J.; Wagner, R. 1992. BICOVER: A national research network on biological control of competing vegetation. In: R. G. Richardson, compiler, *Proceedings of the First International Weed Control Congress*. Melbourne, Australia.
16. Pitt, D.G.; Dumas, M.T.; Wall, R.E.; Thompson, D.G.; Lanteigne, L.; Hintz, W.; Sampson, G.; Wagner, R.G. 1999. *Chondrostereum purpureum* as a biological control agent in forest vegetation management. I. Efficacy on speckled alder, red maple, and aspen in eastern Canada. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 29:841-851.
17. Harper, G.J.; Comeau, P.G.; Hintz, W.; Wall, R.E.; Prasad, R.; Becker, E.M. 1999. *Chondrostereum purpureum* as a biological control agent in forest vegetation management. II. Efficacy on Sitka alder and aspen in western Canada. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 29: 7, 852-858.

18. Harper, G.J.; Comeau, P.G.; Biring, B.S. 2005. A comparison of herbicide and mulch mat treatments for reducing grass, herb, and shrub competition in the BC interior Douglas-fir zone - Ten-year results. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry* 20(3):167-176.
19. Thomas, K.D.; Reid, W.J.; Comeau, P.G. 2001. Vegetation management using polyethylene mulch mats and glyphosate herbicide in a coastal British Columbia hybrid poplar plantation: four-year growth response. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry* 16(1):26-30.
20. Wagner, R.G.; Flynn, J.; Gregory, R.; Mertz, C.K.; Slovic, P. 1998. Acceptable practices in Ontario's forests: Differences between the public and forestry professionals. *New Forests* 16:139-154.
21. Thompson, D.G.; Wojtaszek, B.F.; Staznik, B.; Chartrand, D.T.; Stephenson, G.R. 2004. Chemical and biomonitoring to assess potential acute effects of Vision® herbicide on native amphibian larvae in forest wetlands. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 23(4):843-849.
22. Thompson, D.G.; Chartrand, D.; Leach, J.; Staznik, B.; Hodgins, P. 2010. Integrating advanced technologies for optimization of aerial herbicide applications. *New Forests* 40: 45-66.
23. Durkin, P.R. 2003. Glyphosate - Human health and ecological risk assessment report. Syracuse Environmental Research Associates Inc. March 1, 2003 Contract No.: SERA TR 02-43-09-04a.
24. Williams, G.M.; Kroes, R.; Munroe, I.C. 2000. Safety evaluation and risk assessment of the herbicide Roundup and its active ingredient, glyphosate, for humans. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* 31:117-165.
25. World Health Organization. 1994. International programme on chemical safety. Environmental health criteria 159-glyphosate. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.
26. Wojtaszek, B.F.; Staznik, B.; Chartrand, D.T.; Stephenson, G.R.; Thompson, D.G. 2004. Effects of Vision® herbicide on mortality, avoidance response, and growth of amphibian larvae in two forest wetlands. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 23(4):832-842.
27. Thompson, D.G.; Pitt, D.G.; Buscarini, T.; Staznik, B.; Thomas, D.R.; Kettela, E.G. 1994. Initial deposits and persistence of forest herbicide residues in sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*) foliage. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 24(11):2251-62.
28. Thompson, D.G.; Pitt, D.G.; Buscarini, T.M.; Staznik, B.; Thomas, D.R. 2000. Comparative fate of glyphosate and triclopyr herbicides in the forest floor and mineral soil of an Acadian forest regeneration site. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 30:1808-16.
29. Roy, D.N. Konar, S.K.; Banerjee, S.; Charles, D.A.; Thompson, D.G.; Prasad R. 1989. Persistence, movement, and degradation of glyphosate in selected Canadian boreal forest soils. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry* 37:437-40.
30. Newton, M.; Horner, L.M.; Cowell, J.E.; White, D.E.; Cole, E.C. 1994. Dissipation of glyphosate and aminomethylphosphonic acid in North American forests. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 42(8):1795-802.
31. Newton, M.; Howard, K.M.; Kelpsas, B.R.; Danhaus, R.; Lottman, C.M.; Dubelman, S. 1984. Fate of glyphosate in an Oregon forest. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 32:1144-1151.
32. Feng, J.C.; Thompson, D.G. 1990. Fate of glyphosate in a Canadian forest watershed. 2. Persistence in foliage and soils. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry* 38:1118-1125.
33. Feng, J.C.; Thompson, D.G.; Reynolds, P.E. 1990. Fate of glyphosate in a Canadian forest watershed. 1. Aquatic residues and off-target deposit assessment. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry* 38:1110-1118.
34. Goldsborough, L.G.; Beck, A.E. 1989. Rapid dissipation of glyphosate in small forest ponds. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 18:537-544.
35. Sullivan, T.P.; Wagner, R.G.; Pitt, D.G.; Lautenschlager, R.A.; Chen, D.G. 1998. Changes in diversity of plant and small mammal communities after herbicide application in sub-boreal spruce forest. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 28(2):168-177.
36. Sullivan, T.P.; Sullivan, D.S. 2004. Vegetation management and ecosystem disturbance: impact of glyphosate herbicide on plant and animal diversity in terrestrial systems. *Environmental Review* 11:37-59.
37. Lautenschlager, R.A. 1992. Effects of conifer release with herbicides on moose: browse production, habitat use, and residues in meat. *Alces* 28:215-222.
38. Lautenschlager, R.A.; Dalton, W.J.; Cherry, M.L.; Graham, J.L. 1999. Conifer release alternatives increase aspen forage quality in northwestern Ontario. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 63(4):1320-1326.
39. Legris, J.; Couture, G. 1991. Résidus de glyphosate dans le gibier (lievre, orignal et cerf de virginie) suite à des pulvérisations en milieu forestier en 1988. Quebec Ministère des Forêts. Direction de l'évaluation environnementale. Charlesbourg Quebec. 24 p.

## CONTACT INFORMATION

Dean Thompson  
 Great Lakes Forestry Centre  
 1219 Queen Street East  
 Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada  
 P6A 2E5  
 Phone: 705-949-9461  
 Fax: 705-541-5700  
<http://cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/regions/glfc>  
 E-mail: [GLFCWeb@nrcan.gc.ca](mailto:GLFCWeb@nrcan.gc.ca)

## 2011 International Year of Forests Forests for People

Canadian Forest Service, Great Lakes Forestry Centre  
 1219 Queen St. East,  
 Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, P6A 2E5  
 (705) 949-9461  
 © Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2011  
 Catalogue No. Fo123-1/111E-PDF  
 ISBN 978-1-100-18413-5  
 ISSN 1717-6980

For information regarding reproduction rights, please contact Public Works and Government Services Canada at: 613-996-6886 or at: [droitdauteur.copyright@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:droitdauteur.copyright@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca)