

SUPPORTING SOUTH DAKOTA FARMERS



THE PROBLEM

For over half a century, glyphosate—the most commonly used pesticide—has enabled better yields and lower weed control costs for millions of farmers in the U.S. No health regulator anywhere in the world has ever found it to be a carcinogen.

Yet, despite the clear science behind its safety and benefits, a lack of legislative certainty has invited the litigation industry to file thousands of lawsuits fueled by over \$100 million in expansive marketing and TV ads.

This uncertainty has also enabled efforts in states like California to regulate pesticides in a manner inconsistent with federal law, congressional intent, and scientific consensus.

Combined, these efforts threaten South Dakota farmers' access to their #1 defense against weeds.

If we don't act, the future of glyphosate and other valuable crop protection tools and critical innovations may be at stake.

THE IMPLICATIONS

Glyphosate is the backbone of modern farming. Glyphosate-based herbicides are also among the most extensively tested products of their kind, which is one reason so many growers and others continue to rely on glyphosate to help them safely, successfully, and sustainably control problematic weeds.

FOOD SECURITY

South Dakota farmers rely on pesticides to grow their crops and keep yields high, ensuring we have enough to eat.

- Up to 40% of crops are lost to pests and diseases each year. Without pesticides, losses could be as high as 85%.
- As a top-10 producer of corn and soybeans, South Dakota farmers depend on glyphosate for successful harvests. **80% of all corn and 92% of soybean acres rely on glyphosate.**

FOOD PRICES

Without pesticides like glyphosate, lower yields and increased input costs will force consumers to pay even higher food prices.

- Pesticides save the average family of four up to 48% on their average grocery bill.
- Without glyphosate specifically, food inflation could more than double—adding up to \$10 billion to the cost of food for American households every year.

FARMERS' LIVELIHOOD

Reduced access to glyphosate would increase costs and hurt the ability of South Dakota's family farms to grow their crops and plan for the future.

- Glyphosate helps South Dakota farmers keep their costs low. Without glyphosate, farmers' input costs could more than double.
- Without glyphosate, farmers producing crops like corn, soybeans, wheat, rice, peanuts, sorghum, oats, and barley would lose more than **\$2.89 billion annually** in net farm income.

THE SOLUTION

Manufacturers and the farmers who depend on their products need legislative certainty at the state and federal level that ensures that any pesticide registered with the EPA—and sold under a label consistent with the EPA's own determinations—is sufficient to satisfy requirements for health and safety warnings.