

BCS VS EPA

2

1

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Right: 0.25"
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
- Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt
- Formatted: Not Different first page header

~~Bayer Crop Science versus Environmental Protection Agency: Could it go more wrong? Bayer~~

Crop Science versus Environmental Protection Agency: Could It Go More Wrong?

Student Name

Texas Tech University

Commented [DD1]: Consider title after colon to "Could It Have Gone More Wrong?"

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

Bayer Crop Science versus Environmental Protection Agency: Could it go more wrong? Bayer Crop Science versus Environmental Protection Agency: Could It Go More Wrong?

Do two wrongs ever make a right? In this case, there were multiple wrongs on both sides of the issue. Bayer Crop Science, a branch of a very successful and well-known German pharmaceutical and chemical company, ~~Bayer~~, sold a controversial and potentially harmful product, flubendiamide, for almost nine years without the slightest feeling of guilt towards what they were about potentially ~~doing to the~~ environmental effects. In contrast, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), failed to impose actual condemning regulations on the product although EPA felt that there were harmful consequences associated with regular use of this product. Why was this scandal able to go on for almost nine years without any justice and what were the effects on the American farmer? OR Bayer and the EPA failed to serve justice to the environment and American farmer in a timely manner.

Commented [DD2]: In the article you sent me, they just used "EPA" versus "the EPA." You might double check this.

### Overview

On July 26, 2008, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) granted Bayer "conditional registration" of their pesticide flubendiamide. The EPA only granted a conditional registration because of their concerns that flubendiamide seeps into the soil and causes harm to aquatic invertebrates. Under the conditional approval, Bayer could go still sell their this product, but the company had five years to show that the positive effects of this product outweighed the negatives. If they failed to do that so, the EPA would enforce require that Bayer had to voluntarily cancel their use of flubendiamide per the terms of the conditional registration. Seven and a half years later on, January 29, 2016, the EPA decided to finally follow up on this issue and delivered a letter to Bayer stating that they had until, February 5, 2016, to voluntarily cancel all of their products containing flubendiamide as Bayer had failed to provide substantial evidence

Commented [DD3]: Need citation

that flubendiamide did not harm aquatic invertebrates. In response to this, on February 5<sup>th</sup>, Bayer stated that they were going to seek a review of the product’s registration in an administrative law hearing and refused to pull the product. This meant that yet again flubendiamide was able to stay on the shelves and more research was going to be conducted, but, however, by pushing through a hearing, Bayer placed the burden of that research was put on the EPA. This caused much controversy and a hearing before the EPA’s Environmental Appeals Board. In the end, Bayer gave up the fight and decided to discontinue flubendiamide. ~~Could this have been solved in a timelier manner by stricter government regulations and/or more compliance on Bayer’s part?~~ In a statement issued on \_\_\_\_\_, Bayer said “\_\_\_\_\_.” Therefore, while Bayer will not make further products using flubendiamide, they will be allowed to sell remaining products already containing flubendiamide.

### Bayer’s Faults

Bayer has a huge influence on the agriculture industry all over the globe. This is not the first time they have run into issues with the EPA and they certainly knew how to buy themselves time to try and prove their product’s innocence, all the while still being able to sell it. As a pesticide and insecticide distributor, Bayer is responsible for knowing the effects that their products could potentially have on the environment and making sure that they do not impose a harmful consequence on the Earth. However, on the other hand, Bayer is also a business with a profit maximization mindset. It seems as though Bayer was mainly concerned about making money, rather than thinking about the harmful effects the product they were selling could have on the environment. If Bayer truly believed that their product was not harmful to the environment, why did they not conduct enough of their own research to prove the EPA wrong? Charlotte Sanson (201?), a Bayer employee stated in an interview with AgFax, “We were driven

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Right: 0.25"
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
- Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

- Commented [DD4]: Avoid using rhetorical questions.
- Commented [DD5]: Insert a quotation from a source here

- Commented [DD6]: Should be centered as it is a primary section heading and not a secondary heading with another section
- Formatted: Centered
- Commented [DD7]: Why? Explain in more detail.
- Commented [DD8]: Cite

- Commented [DD9]: How does this relate to their “faults” (which is what you have titled this section)? Make sure that everything ties back to that section heading or change your section heading.
- Commented [DD10]: Rhetorical question
- Commented [DD11]: Needs date published after the name for the citation.

[to refute the voluntary cancellation] by the belief that EPA had acted unlawfully and without scientific justification. Specifically, we believed that EPA should not be permitted to force a cancellation through a streamlined process devoid of a public discussion of scientific findings and benefits of the product, and that EPA’s conduct presented a dangerous precedent for the industry.” ~~This was in reference to their time under review by the Environmental Appeals Board.~~ It seems as though Bayer was more concerned with the process of how their product was revoked of its registration rather than why it was cancelled. ~~Bayer acted as a child and did not step up to the plate and prove themselves, but instead, “talked back” to the EPA and EAB arguing against how they were being regulated.~~ There are multiply different ways that Bayer Crop Science could have gone about handling the entire situation, and could possibly still be selling flubendiamide had they changed their approach.

### EPA’s Faults

~~On the other hand, the Environmental Protection Agency could have changed their approach to the situation as well.~~ The topic of “conditional registrations” in general is a very controversial behavior ~~of by~~ the EPA. Conditional registrations are a good idea in theory; however, after a review from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the office that is responsible for making sure that the government is working efficiently, the GAO discovered that the EPA doesn’t have an efficient system for recalling ~~which~~ products ~~that received they issued~~ a conditional registration ~~to~~. The EPA’s database also does not have an option to change registrations from conditional to unconditional if all requirements are met. Along with that, the EPA has misused the term and applied it to many products that might have just needed a label change. ~~F~~for example. Finally, the EPA doesn’t have a reliable system to keep track of key information related to conditional registrations such as whether companies have submitted

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Right: 0.25"
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
- Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

Commented [DD12]: Don’t assume. State factual information based in research.

Commented [DD13]: Again, you either need to rename this section or rearrange the inso so you’re actually talking about Bayer’s Faults

Formatted: Centered

Commented [DD14]: Cite

Commented [DD15]: Provide an example from a source

~~additional data within the required time frame. ((( ))) On top of that, the Center for Food Safety also expressed their concerns about conditional registrations during the Bayer vs. EPA scandal. According to Peter T. Jenkins (201?), an attorney for Center for Food Safety, stated that this situation between Bayer and EPA, “[p]rovides a strong demonstration that the current conditional registration system is unreliable and unable to protect Americans or the environment.”~~

~~On top of~~In addition to the problems with conditional registrations in general, the EPA ~~had a few more things they could have handled better~~could have handled the Bayer situation differently in general. For example, ~~t~~The EPA gave Bayer a year and a half longer than they were supposed to ~~have~~ before requesting any additional information, which allowed Bayer to keep selling flubendiamide even longer. Also, they didn’t give Bayer an actual ultimatum when they ~~gave them the option to~~requested Bayer “voluntarily remove” flubendiamide. If the EPA was more organized and had ~~they~~ given Bayer stricter consequences, the outcome could have been completely different.

### Effects on the American Farmer

~~Agriculture is a staple industry in America. However, that does not mean that it is easy. Farmers are constantly having to adapt their farming techniques. I~~ in order to stay ahead of insect’s immunity to pesticides and insecticides farmers are constantly having to adapt their farming techniques, all the while remaining environmentally friendly. ~~Uncontrollable variables are ever-present in the farming industry. One variable that many American farmers had depended upon s~~Since 2008 ~~was~~ the availability of ~~an effective pesticide, particularly,~~ flubendiamide has helped farmers combat insects and pests. This pesticide was very widely used on over 200 crops and for multiple pests. Guz Lorenz (201?), an entomologist at the University of Arkansas,

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Right: 0.25"
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
- Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

Commented [DD16]: Unless it’s actually lower case in original source, then no brackets needed.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

Commented [DD17]: The Bayer Faults section needs to be more like this section

Commented [DD18]: Thesis talks about farmer and ENVIRONMENT – include this here

Formatted: Centered

Commented [DD19]: Insert a statement after this sentence explaining why this pesticide was effective.

commented on how the removal of this product is affecting farmers saying, “[i]t is just one less bullet growers have to get pests under control. Less competition is not beneficial. It means the price goes up on other products. It’s getting so difficult for our growers to be profitable.”

Because of the actions of the EPA and Bayer, flubendiamide, which might or might not be harmful to the environment, has been discontinued, causing a monopoly-price increase on other pesticides of its kind that do not work as well. If this situation was handled differently, the American farmer might not be facing these challenges.

Furthermore, preliminary research has shown that flubendiamide can be harmful to aquatic invertebrates.

This is definitely a turning point for both Bayer and the EPA. Regardless of the effects on farmers and the environment, this debate has been a serious issue. This controversy brought the EPA’s lack of organization on the topic of conditional registration to the light. Along with that, Bayer lost one of their most widely used products. The EPA and Bayer Crop Science used the regulation process to avoid engaging in meaningful conversation and research. Both parties were wrong in the way they handled the situation and that shows in the effects that it has had on the American farmer and the environment.

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Right: 0.25"
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
- Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

Commented [DD20]: And then explain more about effects on the environment to match your thesis.

Commented [DD21]: Explain more about how their decisions did not do justice to the American farmer and the environment (go back to your thesis)

References

Last Name, F. M. (Year). Article Title. *Journal Title*, Pages From - To.

Last Name, F. M. (Year). *Book Title*. City Name: Publisher Name.

<https://agfax.com/2016/10/07/soybeans-loss-of-belt-sc-insecticide-places-hardship-on-midsouth-growers-dtn/>

[Neeley, T. \(2016, October 7\). Soybeans: loss of belt sc insecticide places hardship on midsouth growers -- DTN. Retried from https://agfax.com/2016/10/07/soybeans-loss-of-belt-sc-insecticide-places-hardship-on-midsouth-growers-dtn/](https://agfax.com/2016/10/07/soybeans-loss-of-belt-sc-insecticide-places-hardship-on-midsouth-growers-dtn/)

<https://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/issues/304/pollinators-and-pesticides/press-releases/4226/center-for-food-safety-challenges-epas-failure-to-enforce-water-protections#>

[Center for Food Safety. \(2016, February 11\). Center for food safety challenges EPAs failure to enforce water protections. Retrieved from](https://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/issues/304/pollinators-and-pesticides/press-releases/4226/center-for-food-safety-challenges-epas-failure-to-enforce-water-protections#)

[https://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/issues/304/pollinators-and-pesticides/press-releases/4226/center-for-food-safety-challenges-epas-failure-to-enforce-water-protections.](https://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/issues/304/pollinators-and-pesticides/press-releases/4226/center-for-food-safety-challenges-epas-failure-to-enforce-water-protections#)

<https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/flubendiamide-notice-intent-cancel-and-other-supporting>

[United States Environmental Protection Agency. \(2016, March 4\). Flubendiamide – notice of intent to cancel and other supporting documents. Retried from https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/flubendiamide-notice-intent-cancel-and-other-supporting](https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/flubendiamide-notice-intent-cancel-and-other-supporting)

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Right: 0.25"

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

Commented [DD22]: References should be organized alphabetically by the first letter in each citation. I have included the proper citation beneath each of your website links. For help with any additional sources, visit the Purdue Online Writing Lab for APA formatting.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, (Asian) Japanese

Formatted: Normal

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Font: Times New Roman
- Formatted: Right: 0.25"
- Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
- Formatted: (Asian) Japanese, Kern at 12 pt

<https://www.cropscience.bayer.us/news/press-releases/2016/02052016-bayer-contests-epas-decision-on-valuable-insecticide-for-farmers?xtmc=flubendiamide&xtnp=1&xtr=1>

Crop Science. (2016, February 5). Bayer contests EPA's decision on valuable insecticide for farmers. Retrieved from <https://www.cropscience.bayer.us/news/press-releases/2016/02052016-bayer-contests-epas-decision-on-valuable-insecticide-for-farmers?xtmc=flubendiamide&xtnp=1&xtr=1>.

<https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-145>

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2013, August 8). EPA should take steps to improve its oversight of conditional registrations. Retrieved from <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-145>