

Figure I. A diagram showing the individual environmental factors that were evaluated in developing the environmental impact quotient of pesticides (EIQ) model.

return to A Method to Measure the Environmental Impact of Pesticides.




Table 1 lists the specific ratings for the individual factors evaluated. All pesticides were evaluated using the same criteria except for the mode of action and plant surface persistence of herbicides. Because herbicides are generally systemic in nature and are not normally applied to food crops we decided to consider this class of compounds differently, so all herbicides were given a value of one for systemic activity. This has no effect on the relative rankings within herbicides, but it does make the consumer component of the equation for herbicides more realistic. Also, since plant surface persistence is only important for post-emergent herbicides and not pre-emergent herbicides, all post-emergent herbicides were assigned a value of three and pre-emergent herbicides assigned a value of one for this factor.

Table 1. The rating system used to develop the environmental impact quotient of pesticides (EIQ) model. 1 = least toxic or least harmful, 5 = most toxic or harmful.

Mode of Action non-systemic- 1 all herbicides - 1 systemic - 3	Toxicity to Fish-96 hr LC50 > 10 ppm - 1 1-10 ppm - 3 < 1 ppm - 5
Acute Dermal LD50 for Rabbits/Rats(m&/kg) >2000 - 1 200 - 2000 - 3 0 - 200 - 5	Toxicity to Birds-8 day LC50 > 1000 ppm - 1 100-1000 ppm - 3 1-100 ppm - 5
Long-Term Health Effects little or none - 1 possible- 3 definite - 5	Toxicity to Bees relatively nontoxic - 1 moderately toxic - 3 highly toxic - 5
Plant Surface Residue Half-life 1-2 weeks- 1 2-4 weeks- 3 > 4 weeks - 5 pre-emergent herbicides - 1 post-emergent herbicides - 3	Toxicity to Beneficials low impact- 1 moderate impact - 3 severe impact - 5
Soil Residue Half-life Tl/2 <30 days - 1 Tl/2=30-100 days - 3 Tl/2 >100 days - 5	Groundwater and Runoff Potential small - 1 medium - 3 large -5

In order to further organize and simplify the data, a model was developed called the environmental impact quotient of pesticides (EIQ). This model reduces the environmental impact information to a single value. To accomplish this, an equation was developed based on the three principal components of agricultural production systems: a farm worker component, a consumer component, and an ecological component. Each component in the equation is given equal weight in the final analysis, but within each component, individual factors are weighted differently. Coefficients used in the equation to give additional weight to individual factors are also based on a one to five scale. Factors carrying the most weight are multiplied by five, medium-impact factors are multiplied by three, and those factors considered to have the least impact are multiplied by one. A consistent rule throughout the model is that the impact potential of a specific pesticide on an individual environmental factor is equal to the toxicity of the chemical times the potential for exposure. Stated simply, environmental impact is equal to toxicity times exposure. For example, fish toxicity is calculated by determining the inherent toxicity of the compound to fish times the likelihood of the fish encountering the pesticide. In this manner, compounds that are toxic to fish but short-lived have lower impact values than compounds that are toxic and long-lived.

The EIQ Equation

The formula for determining the EIQ value of individual pesticides is listed below and is the average of the farm worker, consumer, and ecological components.

$$EIQ = \{C[(DT*5)+(DT*P)] + [(C*((S+P)/2)*SY)+(L)] + [(F*R)+(D*((S+P)/2)*3)+(Z*P*3)+(B*P*5)]\} / 3$$

DT = dermal toxicity, C = chronic toxicity, SY = systemicity, F = fish toxicity, L = leaching potential, R = surface loss potential, D = bird toxicity, S = soil half-life, Z = bee toxicity, B = beneficial arthropod toxicity, P = plant surface half-life.

Farm worker risk is defined as the sum of applicator exposure (DT* 5) plus picker exposure (DT*P) times the long-term health effect or chronic toxicity (C). Chronic toxicity of a specific pesticide is calculated as the average of the ratings from various long-term laboratory tests conducted on small mam-

mals. These tests are designed to determine potential reproductive effects (ability to produce offspring), teratogenic effects (deformities in unborn offspring), mutagenic effects (permanent changes in hereditary material such as genes and chromosomes), and oncogenic effects (tumor growth). Within the farm-worker component, applicator exposure is determined by multiplying the dermal toxicity (DT) rating to small laboratory mammals (rabbits or rats) times a coefficient of five to account for the increased risk associated with handling concentrated pesticides. Picker exposure is equal to dermal toxicity (DT) times the rating for plant surface residue half-life potential (the time required for one-half of the chemical to break down). This residue factor takes into account the weathering of pesticides that occurs in agricultural systems and the days to harvest restrictions that may be placed on certain pesticides.

The consumer component is the sum of consumer exposure potential ($C * ((S+P)/2) * SY$) plus the potential groundwater effects (L). Groundwater effects are placed in the consumer component because they are more of a human health issue (drinking well contamination) than a wildlife issue. Consumer exposure is calculated as chronic toxicity (C) times the average for residue potential in soil and plant surfaces (because roots and other plant parts are eaten) times the systemic potential rating of the pesticide (the pesticide's ability to be absorbed by plants).

The ecological component of the model is composed of aquatic and terrestrial effects and is the sum of the effects of the chemicals on fish ($F * R$), birds ($D * ((S+P)/2) * 3$), bees ($Z * P * 3$), and beneficial arthropods ($B * P * 5$). The environmental impact of pesticides on aquatic systems is determined by multiplying the chemical toxicity to fish rating times the surface runoff potential of the specific pesticide (the runoff potential takes into account the half-life of the chemical in surface water).

The impact of pesticides on terrestrial systems is determined by summing the toxicities of the chemicals to birds, bees, and beneficial arthropods. Because terrestrial organisms are more likely to occur in commercial agricultural settings than fish, more weight is given to the pesticidal effects on these terrestrial organisms. Impact on birds is measured by multiplying the rating of toxicity to birds by the average half-life on plant and soil surfaces times three. Impact on bees is measured by taking the pesticide toxicity ratings to bees times the half-life on plant surfaces times three. The effect on beneficial arthropods is

determined by taking the pesticide toxicity rating to beneficial natural enemies times the half-life on plant surfaces times five. Because arthropod natural enemies spend almost all of their life in agroecosystem communities (while birds and bees are somewhat transient), their exposure to the pesticides, in theory, is greater. To adjust for this increased exposure, the pesticide impact on beneficial arthropods is multiplied by five. Mammalian wildlife toxicity is not included in the terrestrial component of the equation because mammalian exposure (farm worker and consumer) is already included in the equation, and these health effects are the results of tests conducted on small mammals such as rats, mice, rabbits, and dogs.

After the data on individual factors were collected, pesticides were grouped by classes (fungicides, insecticides/miticides, and herbicides), and calculations were conducted for each pesticide. When toxicological data were missing, the average for each environmental factor within a class was determined, and this average value was substituted for the missing values. Thus, missing data did not affect the relative ranking of a pesticide within a class. Table 2 lists over 120 pesticides by chemical class, fungicides, insecticides/miticides, and herbicides.

Table 2: List of Pesticides

http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/publications/EIQ/files/EIQ_values_2012entire.pdf

http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/publications/EIQ/files/EIQ_values_2012fung.pdf

http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/publications/EIQ/files/EIQ_values_2012herb.pdf

http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/publications/EIQ/files/EIQ_values_2012insect.pdf

The values of individual effects of each pesticide (applicator, picker, consumer, groundwater, aquatic, bird, bee, beneficials), the major components of the equation (farm worker, consumer, and ecological) and the average EIQ values are presented in the tables. The tables also include the factors in the evaluation process that contained missing data. Less confidence should be placed on the EIQ values of pesticides that have many data gaps and more confidence

placed on EIQ values with few or no data gaps. Using the tables, comparisons of environmental toxicity of a given weight (pounds, grams, etc.) of the individual active ingredients can be made within a class of compounds. Field comparisons should not be made with these data. Other considerations, such as the percent of active ingredient in a formulated product and the dose required to provide control, need to be assessed before the desirable or least toxic pesticide choice can be made in the field.

EIQ Field Use Rating

Once an EIQ value has been established for the active ingredient of each pesticide, field use calculations can begin. To accurately compare pesticides and pest management strategies, the dose, the formulation or percent active ingredient of the product, and the frequency of application of each pesticide need to be determined. To account for different formulations of the same active ingredient and different use patterns, a simple equation called the EIQ Field Use Rating was developed. This rating is calculated by multiplying the EIQ value for the specific chemical obtained in the tables by the percent active ingredient in the formulation by the rate per acre used (usually in pints or pounds of formulated product).

$$\text{EIQ Field Use Rating} = \text{EIQ} \times \% \text{ active ingredient} \times \text{Rate}$$

With this method, comparisons of environmental impact between pesticides and different pest management programs can be made. For example, if several pesticides can be used against a particular pest, which pesticide is the least toxic choice? Table 5 shows an example comparing the environmental impact of three insecticides: carbaryl (Sevin 50WP), endosulfan (Thiodan 50WP), and azinphos-methyl (Guthion 35WP). Although carbaryl has a lower EIQ (22.6) than endosulfan (40.5) or azinphos-methyl (43.1), it may take more of it to provide equivalent control. For example, 6 lbs/acre of Sevin may provide the same level of control of a certain pest as 3 lbs/acre of Thiodan or 2.2 lbs/acre of Guthion. In this situation, Guthion would have the lowest EIQ Field Use Rating (33.2) and would be the least toxic choice. Thiodan (60.8) would be the second choice and Sevin (67.8) would be the last.

By applying the EIQ Field Use Rating, comparisons can be made between different pest management strategies or programs. To compare different

pest management programs, EIQ Field Use Ratings and number of applications throughout the season are determined for each pesticide. and these values are then summed to determine the total seasonal environmental impact of the particular strategy. Table 6 compares the theoretical environmental impact of several different pest management approaches that have been used in research projects to grow ‘Red Delicious’ apples in New York. In this example, a traditional pest management approach to growing ‘Red Delicious’ apples that does not rely heavily on pest monitoring methods would result in a total theoretical environmental impact of 938 due to pesticides. An IPM approach that incorporates pest monitoring methods, biological control, and least toxic pesticides would have an environmental impact of only 167. The organic pest management approach, which uses only naturally occurring pesticides, would have a theoretical environmental impact of 1,799 according to the model. The environmental impact of the latter approach is so much larger than the other strategies primarily due to the larger quantities of sulfur required and more frequent applications needed to provide the same level of control of apple scab in this variety. By using the EIQ model, it becomes possible for IPM practitioners to rapidly estimate the environmental impact of different pesticides and pest management programs before they are applied, resulting in more environmentally sensitive pest management programs being implemented.

Table 3. An example showing the EIQ field use rating of three different insecticides to determine which pesticide should be the least toxic choice.

Material	EIQ	ai	Rate	EIQ field use rating
Sevin 50WP (carbaryl)	22.6	0.50	6.0	67.8
Thiodan 50WP (endosulfan)	40.5	0.50	3.0	60.8
Guthion 35WP (azinphos- methyl)	43.1	0.35	2.2	33.2

Table 4. Theoretical environmental impact of different pest management strategies used to grow ‘Red Delicious’ apples in New York. Traditional Pest Management Strategy

Traditional Pest Management Strategy					
Material	EIQ	ai	Dose	Applications	Total
Rubigan EC	27.3	0.12	0.6	4	8
Captan 50WP	28.6	0.50	3.0	6	257
Lorsban 50WP	52.8	0.50	3.0	2	158
Thiodan 50WP	40.5	0.50	3.0	2	61
Guthion 35WP	43.1	0.35	2.2	2	66
Cygon 4E	74.0	0.43	2.0	3	191
Omite 6EC	42.7	0.68	2.0	2	116
Kelthane 35WP	29.9	0.35	4.5	1	47
Sevin 50WP	22.6	0.50	1.0	3	34
Total Environmental Impact					938
Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Strategy					
Material	EIQ	ai	Dose	Applications	Total
Nova 40WP	41.2	0.40	0.3	4	20
Captan 50WP	28.6	0.50	3.0	1	43
Dipel 2X	13.5	0.06	1.5	3	4
Sevin 50WP	22.6	0.50	3.0	1	34
Guthion 35WP	43.1	0.35	2.2	2	66
Total Environmental Impact					167
Organic Pest Management Strategy					
Material	EIQ	ai	Dose	Applications	Total
Sulfur	45.5	0.90	6	7	1720
Rotenone/pyrethrin	25.5	0.04	12	6	73
Ryania	55.3	0.001	58	2	6
Total Environmental Impact					1720

Conclusion

The Environmental Impact Quotient has been used to organize the extensive toxicological data available on some common fruit and vegetable pesticides into a usable form for field use. It addresses a majority of the environmental concerns that are encountered in agricultural systems including farm worker, consumer, and wildlife, health, and safety. By using the EIQ Field Use Rating, IPM practitioners and growers can incorporate environmental effects along with efficacy and cost into the pesticide decision-making process. IPM programs can also use the EIQ model as another method to measure the environmental impact of different pest management and pesticide programs. As newer biorational pesticides are marketed with lower EIQ values and more emphasis is placed on biologically based IPM practices, the EIQ field use ratings will continue to decrease. Eventually these ratings may approach zero, resulting in an environmentally neutral or benign agricultural production system.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank D. A. Rutz, W. G. Smith, J. W. Gillette, R. Mungari, J. VanKirk, and D. Pimentel for their valuable input and discussions on the development of this concept and J. Nedrow for help in collecting and organizing the data. We would also like to thank K. M. Theiling for sharing the details of her database.

Literature Cited

EXTOXNET, The EXtension TOXicology NETwork

Hotchkiss, B. E., J. W. Gillett, M. A. Kamrin, J. W. Witt, and A. Craigmill. 1989. EXTOXNET, Extension Toxicology Network. A Pesticide Information Project of Cooperative Extension Offices of Cornell University, The University of California, Michigan State University and Oregon State University, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

Morse, R. 1989. Bee Poisoning, In the New York State Pesticide Recommendations 1989 edition. The Chemicals-Pesticides Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. 28-30.