

The Barrasso Bill Would Undermine the Endangered Species Act

Topline

- The Barrasso bill is all about politics, not science, and especially not improving the conservation of endangered species.

What's at Stake?

- The Barrasso bill would dramatically weaken the Endangered Species Act (ESA) – our nation's most effective law protecting wildlife in danger of extinction. The bill would:
 - Undermine the ESA's reliance on science, especially in recovering species
 - Give states the ability to veto endangered species restoration projects and, had it been law, would have prevented the restoration of wolves to Yellowstone and the Northern Rockies
 - Make it harder to list imperiled species by requiring recovery goals during listing
 - Reduce public involvement and agency accountability
 - Slow agency conservation actions by requiring cumbersome and unnecessary new procedures

Who Benefits?

- This partisan bill was openly written to promote the agenda of the Western Governors Association and seeks to impose overweening and inappropriate state control over the most important processes to list, protect and recover imperiled species under the ESA.
- States lack the legal authority, resources and political resolve to implement the ESA.
 - A 2017 study by the U.C. Irvine School of Law's Center for Land, Environment and Natural Resources entitled the Limitations of State Laws and Resources for Endangered Species Protections found, among other things:
 - Only 4% of states have authority to promote the recovery of imperiled species
 - Only 5% of spending on imperiled species is by the states
 - Only 10% of states have significant habitat safeguards
 - Recent examples of states lacking the political will to protect endangered species, or are opening hostile to their protection, include:
 - New Mexico's state government has been openly hostile to the federal effort to recover Mexican wolves.
 - North Carolina's state government has been openly hostile to the federal effort to reintroduce and recover red wolves in a five-county area around Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge.
 - When gray wolves were listed as endangered in the Northern Rockies both Idaho and Wyoming advocated for expanded lethal control of wolves and both states adopted minimally protective management plans.

American Bird Conservancy * American Rivers * Animal Welfare Institute * Born Free USA
Californians for Western Wilderness * Center for Biological Diversity * Clean Water Action
Colorado Native Plant Society * Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship * Defenders of Wildlife
Delaware Ecumenical Council on Children and Families * Delaware-Otsego Audubon Society
Earthjustice * Earthworks * Endangered Habitats League * Endangered Species Coalition
Environmental Action Committee of West Marin * Environmental Protection Information Center
Friends of Blackwater, Inc. * Friends of the Earth US * Friends of the Sonoran Desert
Friends of the WI Wolf and Wildlife * Great Lakes Wildlife Alliance
Great Old Broads for Wilderness * Great Old Broads for Wilderness-GJ Broadband
Hoosier Environmental Council * Howling for Wolves * Humane Society Legislative Fund
Indiana Forest Alliance * Klamath Forest Alliance * League of Conservation Voters
Lower Ohio River Waterkeeper * Maine Audubon * National Parks Conservation Association
National Wolfwatcher Coalition * Natural Born Juicers * Natural Resources Council of Maine
Natural Resources Defense Council * New Hampshire Audubon
New Mexico Wilderness Alliance * Northcoast Environmental Center
Northern New Mexico Group of Sierra Club * NYC Audubon * Oceana * Onondaga Audubon
Rocky Mountain Recreation Initiative * Rocky Mountain Wild * Save Animals Facing Extinction
Save the Manatee Club * Save Wolves Now Network * Sierra Club
Southern Adirondack Audubon Society, Inc.
Southern Resident Killer Whale Chinook Salmon Initiative
The Humane Society of the United States * Trap Free Montana * Trap Free Montana Public Lands
Turtle Island Restoration Network * Union of Concerned Scientists
Western Environmental Law Center * Western Nebraska Resources Council
Western Watersheds Project * Wild Utah Project * Wildlands Network * Wolf Conservation Center

July 17, 2018

The Honorable John Barrasso
Chairman
Environment and Public Works Committee
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Tom Carper
Ranking Member
Environment and Public Works Committee
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Barrasso and Ranking Member Carper:

The Senate Environment and Public Works committee meets today for a hearing on Chairman Barrasso's draft legislation entitled the "Endangered Species Act Amendments of 2018," a bill that would more aptly be named the "Eliminating Species Act." Given that the Endangered Species Act (ESA) has proven highly effective at preventing the extinction of species under its care, we strongly believe this is nothing more than a politically motivated attempt to undermine this successful, popular law at the expense of sound science and the conservation of imperiled species. We write on behalf of our millions of members and supporters to express strong opposition to this draft legislation.

The Endangered Species Act is our nation's most effective law for protecting wildlife in danger of extinction. By the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's own statistics, 99 percent of species listed under the Act have survived, and many are on the path to recovery. On May 18, 2018, nearly 1,500 scientists sent a letter¹ urging Congress not to weaken the Endangered Species Act because it is one of the most successful pieces of legislation and uses the best available science to help imperiled species recover. Given this incredible success, it should come as no surprise that the ESA is also extremely popular, earning the support of 90 percent of voters.² The American public expects that our rich biological heritage will be preserved for future generations to enjoy and the ESA ensures that the nation meets that expectation.

The draft legislation would dramatically weaken this effective and popular wildlife conservation law. The bill would:

- Undermine the ESA's reliance on science, especially in recovering species;
- Give states the ability to veto endangered species restoration projects;
- Make it harder to protect imperiled species by requiring recovery goals at the same time as listing;
- Undermine citizen court access and reduce public involvement and agency accountability; and
- Slow agency conservation actions by requiring cumbersome and unnecessary new procedures

This damaging bill seeks to impose state control over the most important processes to list, protect, and recover imperiled species under the ESA — even though states already have broad opportunities to engage in the ESA process. Moreover, states lack the legal authority, resources and political resolve to implement the ESA. A 2017 study³ by the U.C. Irvine School of Law found that:

- Only 4% of states have authority to promote the recovery of imperiled species;
- Only 5% of spending on imperiled species is by the states; and
- Only 10% of states have significant habitat safeguards.

There is no reason to believe that the current effort to "reform" the ESA is anything other than a thinly veiled attempt to gut the law, given that members of Congress have repeatedly tried to do just that. In the 115th Congress alone, there have already been more than 100 individual legislative attacks on the ESA, including efforts to both remove protections for specific species and to undermine the law itself. These attacks are often made in the name of corporate interests, placing short-term economic gain above long-term conservation efforts and demanding changes that would create significant barriers to species protection.

Moreover, industry opponents to the ESA frequently site statistics that are wholly misrepresentative not only of the law's effectiveness, but of the science behind species recovery. Recovery within a relatively few years is simply inaccurate as a metric for success. Furthermore, species are often only listed under the ESA after decades of decline under state management, and only once they have

¹<https://s3.amazonaws.com/ucs-documents/science-and-democracy/esa-letter-final-may-18-2018.pdf>

²<https://defenders.org/press-release/new-national-poll-finds-90-percent-american-voters-support-endangered-species-act>

³<http://www.law.uci.edu/centers/cleanr/news-pdfs/cleanr-esa-report-final.pdf>

reached “emergency room status.” The ESA saves species by preventing extinction and setting them on the long road to recovery. That is the measure of the law’s profound success.

The ESA contains immense flexibility including incidental take permits for land use and other otherwise prohibited activities; cooperative agreements to encourage collaboration and to provide aid to states for conservation projects; and candidate conservation agreements to avoid the need for a formal ESA listing. This flexibility has repeatedly served to reconcile the imperative to save species from extinction and industry concerns.

Recognizing the proven success, immense popularity, and flexibility provided under the law, there is simply no justifiable explanation for this draft legislation or any of the other more than 100 damaging changes to the Endangered Species Act proposed in this Congress.

Sincerely,

American Bird Conservancy	Humane Society Legislative Fund
American Rivers	Indiana Forest Alliance
Animal Welfare Institute	Klamath Forest Alliance
Born Free USA	League of Conservation Voters
Californians for Western Wilderness	Lower Ohio River Waterkeeper
Center for Biological Diversity	Maine Audubon
Clean Water Action	National Parks Conservation Association
Colorado Native Plant Society	National Wolfwatcher Coalition
Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship	Natural Born Juicers
Defenders of Wildlife	Natural Resources Council of Maine
Delaware Ecumenical Council on Children and Families	Natural Resources Defense Council
Delaware-Otsego Audubon Society	New Hampshire Audubon
Earthjustice	New Mexico Wilderness Alliance
Earthworks	Northcoast Environmental Center
Endangered Habitats League	Northern New Mexico Group of Sierra Club
Endangered Species Coalition	NYC Audubon
Environmental Action Committee of West Marin	Oceana
Environmental Protection Information Center	Onondaga Audubon
Friends of Blackwater, Inc.	Rocky Mountain Recreation Initiative
Friends of the Earth US	Rocky Mountain Wild
Friends of the Sonoran Desert	Save Animals Facing Extinction
Friends of the WI Wolf and Wildlife	Save the Manatee Club
Great Lakes Wildlife Alliance	Save Wolves Now Network
Great Old Broads for Wilderness	Sierra Club
Great Old Broads for Wilderness-GJ Broadband	Southern Adirondack Audubon Society, Inc.
Hoosier Environmental Council	Southern Resident Killer Whale Chinook Salmon Initiative
Howling For Wolves	The Humane Society of the United States
	Trap Free Montana

Trap Free Montana Public Lands
Turtle Island Restoration Network
Union of Concerned Scientists
Western Environmental Law Center
Western Nebraska Resources Council
Western Watersheds Project
Wild Utah Project
Wildlands Network
Wolf Conservation Center

SENATE AND HOUSE INTERIOR AND ENVIRONMENT FY19 APPROPRIATIONS COMPARISON

As Congress works through the FY19 Appropriations process, American families are counting on members to pass a budget that increases investments in programs that protect communities and the environment without including any destructive policies that make kids sick and threaten America's outdoors.

The House Interior and Environment Appropriations Bill continues business as usual by including significant cuts to EPA programs and many controversial riders. Although the Senate version does show bipartisan support for EPA funding by rejecting the draconian cuts the administration has twice proposed and new poison pill riders, it would still be one of the smallest EPA budgets in over 30 years.

The Senate version of the bill is a step in the right direction, but more work is needed to achieve a final bill that is free of budget cuts and all anti-environmental riders.

FY19 APPROPRIATIONS		HOUSE	SENATE
Topline Funding		\$35.25 billion (same as FY18 enacted)	\$35.853 billion (\$601 million more than FY18 level)
PROGRAM FUNDING			
EPA		\$100 million cut	\$8.824 billion (same level as FY18)
Interior		\$14 million for DOI reorganization (wasteful spending)	\$14 million for DOI reorganization (wasteful spending)
Fish and Wildlife Service		\$11 million cut	\$19.7 million cut
National Park Service		\$3.255 billion (\$53 million more than FY18 level)	\$3.215 billion (\$13.4 million more than FY18 level)
LWCF		\$65 million cut	\$425 million (same level as FY18)
BLM		Largely level across most accounts, includes a good \$55 million increase for deferred maintenance.	\$1.2 billion (\$13,100,000 more than FY18)
Endangered Species Act		42% cut to Endangered Species	\$1 million cut to

	Listing Program	Endangered Species Listing Program
Wildfire Funding	\$500 million increase	\$500 million increase

SENATE AND HOUSE INTERIOR AND ENVIRONMENT FY19 APPROPRIATIONS POLICY RIDERS AND AMENDMENTS

PREVIOUSLY ENACTED POLICY RIDERS

The House Bill starts does include previously enacted riders (as is common practice), and specifically maintains what was included in the 2018 Omnibus.

This includes:

- **Sage grouse:** Prevents the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from fulfilling its obligations under the Endangered Species Act by disallowing FWS to issue or propose a rule to protect the greater sage grouse.
- **Biomass:** Requires, for FY19, that the EPA treat air emissions from forest biomass activities as non-contributors of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.
- **Lead ammunition:** Permanently prevents the EPA from regulating toxic lead in ammunition, ammunition components, or fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) or any other law.
- **CWA/CAA exemption riders:**
- **Alaska incinerators:** The rider exempts “Small, Remote Incinerators,” all located in Alaska, from clean air protections established by EPA in 2011 for toxic pollution from certain commercial and industrial waste incinerators.

NEW HOUSE POLICY RIDERS

Sage Grouse: Prohibiting the Fish and Wildlife Service from revisiting the status of the Sage Grouse on the Endangered Species list.

Wyoming and Great Lakes Wolves: Requiring the Secretary of the Interior to reissue final rules to delist wolves in Wyoming and the Great Lakes region that were overturned by a federal court and exempts those reissued rules from judicial review.

Gray Wolves: Prohibiting funds to treat any gray wolves, (including the Mexican wolf) range-wide in the lower 48 contiguous States and D.C. as endangered or threatened species.

Trestles: Prohibiting listing of Trestles Historic District, San Diego County, California, on the National Register of Historic Places.

Grazing Permits: Exempting livestock grazing permit renewals from environmental review.

Land Use Planning: Prohibiting new limitations on fishing, shooting activities for hunting, or recreational shooting if such activities were allowed in 2013.

Lead Ammunition and Tackle: Prohibiting the use of funds to regulate the lead content of ammunition or fishing tackle.

Biomass: Permanently requires the EPA to treat air emissions from forest biomass activities as non-contributors of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Ag Discharge: Prohibiting the use of funds to require permits for the discharge of dredged or fill material for certain agricultural activities.

Ag Emissions: Prohibiting the use of funds to require reporting or limiting emissions from manure management and livestock production.

Clean Water Rule: Repealing the existing Clean Water Rule.

Solid Waste: Prohibiting the use of funds to issue any regulation under the Solid Waste Disposal Act that applies to an animal feeding operation.

California Water Fix: Exempting the California WaterFix project from judicial review under state or federal law, including claims arising under the ESA, NEPA, Clean Water Act, California Endangered Species Act, and California Environmental Quality Act.

ADDED VIA FLOOR AMENDMENTS:

EPA Methane Standards: Blocking EPA from implementing its Methane Pollution Standard, the first-ever limits on methane pollution from the oil and gas sector (the largest emitter of methane) and blocking future efforts to regulate existing sources of methane.

Costs of Climate Change: Commanding the federal government to blind itself to the economic costs of climate change.

Washington State Water Quality: Blocking the implementation of vital standards that protect communities from exposure to toxic contaminants such as PCB, arsenic, and mercury, in the fish they eat.

Semi-truck Trailers: Blocking standards that would reduce emissions from medium and heavy duty trucks.

Preble's Jumping Mouse: Blocking recovery efforts for the Preble's Jumping Mouse under the Endangered Species Act.

Endangered Species Act Protections: Blocking protections for species listed under the Endangered Species Act if reviews for the species are late - a common occurrence due to lack of funding or time restraints. This would leave species in a state of limbo, as they would retain ESA status but the government would not be able to act to protect them.

Chesapeake Bay: Blocking basic oversight and contingency actions authorized under the Clean Water Act in order to clean up the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

Specialist Compensation: Blocking EPA from making use of an important program that allows agencies to offer higher pay in certain specialized fields and provide recruitment and retention bonuses. This program allows EPA to compete in the labor market for top-notch science and medical talent.

Revegetation: Blocking the Department of the Interior from performing reclamation of vegetation and wildlife habitats pertaining to specific gold mines in Alaska.

Addressing Climate Change: Blocking potential plans to address climate change.

Lesser Prairie Chicken: Blocking the protection of the Lesser Prairie Chicken under the Endangered Species Act.

California Water: Preempting California law in order to prevent the federal government from complying with new state water quality standards that are being adopted to restore and protect native salmon runs and the health of the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers.

GMO Crops: Forcing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to allow pesticide-promoting, genetically engineered crops on national wildlife refuges where farming is permitting, preventing the agency from managing these public lands for healthy natural ecosystems.

Citizen Suits: Blocking recovery of legal fees for settlements, preventing many communities from being able to get legal representation to enforce critical public health and environmental protections when agencies fail to act.

ADDED VIA COMMITTEE VOTE

Rep. Calvert: The Manager's amendment makes technical and non-controversial changes to the bill and report. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Newhouse: The amendment prohibits funding to reintroduce grizzly bears into certain areas in the State of Washington. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Aderholt/Rep. Visclosky: The amendment ensures that existing "Buy America" standards at the EPA are maintained. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Stewart: The amendment adds bill language allowing the Department of Interior to use sterilization in the management of wild horses and burros. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Amodei: The amendment prohibits funding for the Interior Department to issue a final rule on the "Bi-State" district population of the greater Sage Grouse. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Amodei: Prohibiting any land management agency from placing any limit on the use of water rights as a condition for issuing a permit or other approval to use public lands or a waterway. This could limit reasonable requirements for hydropower projects. The amendment was adopted on a vote of 26-21.

Rep. Herrera Beutler: The amendment prohibits funding for U.S. Fish and Wildlife to require certain additional land to be set-aside for conservation of the marbled murrelet. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Valadao: Precludes judicial review of the Central Valley Project and California State Water Project, including under both federal and state law. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Harris: The amendment adds report language related to the E-15 education outreach program at the EPA. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Kaptur: The amendment adds report language encouraging the EPA to review the backlog of applications related to biogas fuel pathways under the Renewable Fuels Program. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Kaptur – The amendment prohibits funding for the EPA to purchase fountain pens costing more than \$50 each. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Cole – The amendment adds bill language ensuring that trust and treaty obligations are met related to Alaska Native oil and gas revenue sharing. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

Rep. Cole: The amendment adds report language regarding EPA's 2010 guidance issued under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act to provide clarity to states and tribes on certain certifications. The amendment was adopted on a voice vote.

SENATE POLICY RIDERS

The Senate bill contains no new poison pill riders, but does include previously enacted riders (as is common practice), and specifically maintains what was included in the 2018 Omnibus.

This includes:

- **Sage grouse:** Prevents the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from fulfilling its obligations under the Endangered Species Act by disallowing FWS to issue or propose a rule to protect the greater sage grouse.
- **Biomass:** Requires, for FY19, that the EPA treat air emissions from forest biomass activities as non-contributors of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.
- **Lead ammunition:** Permanently prevents the EPA from regulating toxic lead in ammunition, ammunition components, or fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) or any other law.
- **CWA/CAA exemption riders:**
- **Alaska incinerators:** The rider exempts "Small, Remote Incinerators," all located in Alaska, from clean air protections established by EPA in 2011 for toxic pollution from certain commercial and industrial waste incinerators.

SENATE AMENDMENTS

The Senate bill contains no substantive amendments to date.

Interior's proposed regulation changes for the Endangered Species Act

The Trump Administration has just put out three proposed regulation changes. These regulations would change how the Department enforces and carries out protections for endangered wildlife and plants under the Endangered Species Act. These proposed changes would:

- Remove the phrase “without reference to possible economic or other impacts of such determination” from the law when listing endangered species. **Rebuttal:** Existence has no price, and the economic impacts of protecting a species should not enter into a listing decision, the science on species is the most important and objective consideration for listing a species.
- Remove protections against “taking” or killing threatened species, unless a special rule is written for a specific threatened species. **Rebuttal:** Banning the killing of a threatened or endangered species is one of the most significant protections the Endangered Species Act provides for species under its care. Without this protection, threatened species could more quickly decline into endangered status.
- Change the existing requirements of when and how the Federal Government has to consult with FWS or NMFS when beginning a project to ensure they do not harm endangered species. For example, under this new rule, agencies would be exempted from having to consider the impact a project might have on the critical habitat of a species unless it would impact the entirety of that habitat. **Rebuttal:** In order to ensure survival and recovery, Endangered species need to be considered and protected everywhere they are found and in every circumstance, not only when it is convenient or easy to do so.

Senate Ask: Please sign onto this letter to Secretary Zinke and the Department of Interior opposing these proposed rule changes that would result in weakened protections for Endangered Species.

American Bird Conservancy * Amigos Bravos * Animal Welfare Institute
Beyond Pesticides * Born Free USA * Center for Biological Diversity * Clean Water Action
Colorado Native Plant Society * Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship
Defenders of Wildlife * Delaware Ecumenical Council on Children and Families
Earthjustice * Endangered Species Coalition
Environmental Protection Information Center * Environmental Working Group
Farmworker Association of Florida * Food & Water Watch * Frack Free Four Corners
Friends of Blackwater * Friends of the Earth * Friends of the Sonoran Desert
Great Old Broads for Wilderness * GreenLatinos * Gund Institute, University of Vermont
International Fund for Animal Welfare
International Marine Mammal Project of Earth Island Institute * Kettle Song Farm
Klamath Forest Alliance * League of Conservation Voters
Maryland Pesticide Education Network * Maxfield's Market
Native Plant Conservation Campaign * Natural Resources Defense Council
Northcoast Environmental Center * Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides
Onondaga Audubon * Organic Consumers Association * Our Revolution New Mexico
People and Pollinators Action Network * Pollinate Minnesota * Portland State University
Rocky Mountain Wild * San Juan Citizens Alliance * San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council
Save EPA * Save the Manatee Club * Sierra Club * Turtle Island Restoration Network
Union of Concerned Scientists * Vermont Healthy Soils Coalition * Waste Farmers
Western Watersheds Project * WildEarth Guardians
Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation

May 10, 2018

RE: Please Oppose the “Poisoned Pollinators Provision” in the 2018 Farm Bill

Dear Representative,

Our organizations, along with the millions of members and supporters we represent, write to urge you to vote against H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018 (“House Farm Bill”) which includes language best described as the “Poisoned Pollinators Provision.” This dangerous provision puts imperiled species affected by pesticides at risk by removing vital protections under the Endangered Species Act our nation’s most effective law for protecting wildlife in danger of extinction. This vital law has prevented the extinction of more than 99 percent of the species under its care and is supported by 90 percent of American voters.

The “Poisoned Pollinators Provision” would not only harm pollinators and other wildlife – it would harm farmers who depend upon pollination and intact natural systems for sound food production. Native pollinators provide an estimated \$3 billion in crop pollination services to

farmers every year.¹ H.R. 2 is also loaded with other provisions that undermine fundamental environmental laws.

Under current law, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must consult with two expert agencies—the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (“the wildlife agencies”)—to identify and minimize impacts to endangered species caused by pesticide products that EPA registers for commercial use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. When necessary, these science-based interagency consultations result in commonsense protections, such as limits on spraying pesticides in key areas where endangered species live.

The “Poisoned Pollinators Provision” would gut these longstanding requirements and severely curtail the government’s ability to assess the effects of toxic pesticides on imperiled species. In addition, this dangerous legislation would exempt all approved pesticide use from enforcement under the Endangered Species Act, even where it directly kills or injures endangered wildlife. Specifically, this sweeping provision would:

1. Remove the requirement under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for the EPA to consult with the wildlife agencies on the impact of potentially dangerous pesticides on threatened and endangered species before allowing those pesticides to be used (**Section 9111**), and
2. Waive Endangered Species Act Section 9 “take” liability for all pesticides that have been registered according to the procedures of this bill. In other words, if the EPA has allowed a pesticide to be marketed and used, then neither the EPA nor presumably the registrant or end user can be held liable for any harm or death of endangered species resulting from the label-approved use of the product (**Section 9114**).

Congress has never waived Section 9 “take” liability for any class of actions, thus making this provision one of the broadest and most harmful attacks on the Endangered Species Act in its nearly 45-year history. Further, in place of the ESA’s strong, look-before-you-leap measures to protect endangered species, this damaging provision would cut expert federal wildlife agencies out of the process and merely requires EPA to conduct a cursory review of the impacts to endangered species from pesticides, years after approving their use. *And* the provision also seeks to limit the ability of citizens to go to court to protect imperiled species from pesticides.

Endangered species are often the early warning system to alert us to the unintended harms of pesticides. It was the catastrophic decline of the bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and other endangered species that caused the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies to sound the alarm on DDT. Thankfully, the bald eagle, our national symbol, was saved from extinction by the protections afforded by the Endangered Species Act. The Act remains the “gold standard” for species protection and recovery today, both here and around the world. We ask you to protect this vital law, not only to save our most treasured rare plants and animals, but also to protect our

¹ <https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/84035/err-232.pdf?v=42908>

waters, our lands, and our health. **Please oppose the “Poisoned Pollinators Provision” and vote “No” on the 2018 House Farm Bill.**

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Bird Conservancy
Animal Welfare Institute
Beyond Pesticides
Born Free USA
Center for Biological Diversity
Clean Water Action
Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship
Defenders of Wildlife
Earthjustice
Endangered Species Coalition
Environmental Working Group
Food & Water Watch
Friends of the Earth
Friends of the Sonoran Desert
Great Old Broads for Wilderness
GreenLatinos
International Fund for Animal Welfare
International Marine Mammal Project of Earth Island Institute
League of Conservation Voters
Native Plant Conservation Campaign
Natural Resources Defense Council
Organic Consumers Association
Save EPA
Save the Manatee Club
Sierra Club
Turtle Island Restoration Network
Union of Concerned Scientists
Waste Farmers
Western Watersheds Project
WildEarth Guardians
Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

California

Environmental Protection Information Center
Klamath Forest Alliance
Northcoast Environmental Center

Colorado

Colorado Native Plant Society
Maxfield's Market
People and Pollinators Action Network
Rocky Mountain Wild
San Juan Citizens Alliance
San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council

Delaware

Delaware Ecumenical Council on Children and Families

Florida

Farmworker Association of Florida

Maryland

Maryland Pesticide Education Network

Minnesota

Pollinate Minnesota

New Mexico

Amigos Bravos
Frack Free Four Corners
Our Revolution New Mexico

New York

Onondaga Audubon

Oregon

Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides
Portland State University

Vermont

Gund Institute, University of Vermont
Kettle Song Farm
Vermont Healthy Soils Coalition

West Virginia

Friends of Blackwater