We are Evernorth, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to creating an organically aligned world.

EVERNORTH
PURITY FOR THE PEOPLE

TOXICITY AWARENESS · COMPARATIVE TABLES · CONCISE OVERVIEW

Pesticide Reporting in the United States

Victoria Vera | Founder, Evernorth Foundation

November 2026

Synopsis

How thoroughly is pesticide use documented across the United States, and what information is available to the public? Through accessible comparative tables and accompanying analysis, this overview examines federal recordkeeping requirements, reporting practices, public transparency, and regulatory oversight. It also considers the discontinuation of a federal inspection program and pesticide reporting systems in California and New York, exploring how documentation shapes our understanding of chemical applications throughout the country.

A comprehensive companion publication, Pesticide Reporting Standards, provides an extensive examination of federal requirements, historical findings, and supporting evidence. Publication forthcoming.

RESEARCH SCOPE · Selected federal requirements and illustrative reporting systems in California and New York.

Understanding the Record

Every pesticide application occurs at a particular location, on a particular date, involving a specific product and quantity. These details are fundamental to understanding the scale and distribution of pesticide use throughout the United States.

Yet the documentation of these applications is distributed among federal requirements, state reporting programs, applicator records, and agricultural surveys, each operating under its own parameters.

The following comparative tables examine what these systems document, how information is collected and maintained, the extent to which their records are accessible to the public, and what the absence of a cohesive national reporting framework means for understanding the full scope of pesticide use throughout the country.

© 2026 Evernorth Foundation. All rights reserved.

Table One | What Federal Pesticide Reporting Systems Document

Selected federal recordkeeping, reporting, and agricultural survey requirements.

System	Information documented	Records and accessibility
Commercial restricted-use applications	Product; quantity; date; location; applicator; treated site	Applicator retention: ≥2 years; state official access
Agricultural Worker Protection Standard	Product; treated area; application times; active ingredients; entry restrictions	On-site display; 2-year retention; eligible workers and representatives
USDA chemical-use surveys	Selected crops; application rates; treated acreage; estimated quantities	Voluntary surveys; published statistical estimates
State certification-program reports	Certification totals; restricted-use enforcement summaries	Annual submissions to EPA; program oversight

Sources: 40 CFR §171.303; 40 CFR §170.311; USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. [1–3]

Each system contributes information about pesticide use, yet each operates within a distinct reporting framework. Some preserve individual application records, others provide information to agricultural workers or regulatory authorities, while national surveys produce statistical estimates for selected crops.

The resulting information offers several perspectives on pesticide activity across the country, with significant differences in coverage, detail, and public accessibility.

Thoughts to Consider

Understanding the full scope of pesticide use throughout the United States becomes a maze to traverse amid disparate records, reporting requirements, and inconsistent documentation. The fragmentation becomes particularly concerning when considering that pesticides such as glyphosate, malathion, and diazinon have been classified as probably carcinogenic to humans by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC).

With chemicals of such concern entering our shared environments, how can we begin to comprehend the magnitude and geographic distribution of their use when the nation's reporting systems offer such an incomplete and fragmented account?

Federal Recordkeeping and Oversight

The records from 2011 provide a valuable point of reference for examining federal pesticide oversight. At the time, the USDA's Pesticide Recordkeeping Program operated a structured inspection process, providing documented figures through which regulatory compliance and inspection activity could be examined.

© 2026 Evernorth Foundation. All rights reserved.

In fiscal year 2011, the program conducted 4,086 inspections of certified private pesticide applicators, along with 90 follow-up inspections and 83 warning letters. Federal inspections operated across 27 states, while 23 states and Puerto Rico maintained comparable state programs.

Funding reductions soon curtailed the program's activities, and USDA identifies September 2012 as its closure. In July 2025, the agency formally removed its implementing regulations. Although states continue to exercise pesticide enforcement authority, the federal program that once provided this organized measure of recordkeeping inspections has ceased.

The 2011 figures consequently offer a glimpse into an oversight structure that once produced identifiable inspection results. With that framework discontinued and current inspection practices distributed among individual states, establishing a similarly cohesive understanding of recordkeeping oversight throughout the country has become considerably more difficult.

Sources: USDA Federal Pesticide Recordkeeping Program, FY2011 Annual Summary; Federal Register, May 12, 2025. [5–6]

Thoughts to Consider

All of this unfolds during an era of extraordinary technological advancement, when our capacity to track, document, organize, and analyze chemical applications exceeds anything previously possible in recorded history. Scientific research continues to reveal serious concerns surrounding pesticide exposure, and substances such as chlorpyrifos have faced prohibitions in the European Union.

Yet a federal program that once conducted thousands of independent recordkeeping inspections has been discontinued, while pesticide application information remains dispersed among reporting systems with varying requirements and levels of accessibility.

Random inspections allowed regulators to examine pesticide application records independently, while complaint-based inspections depend upon someone first recognizing a potential problem. Yet people living near these applications often have limited access to information about what was applied, where, and when.

What becomes of regulatory accountability when the information necessary to recognize a potential violation and the mechanisms for investigating it are both subject to such limitations?

Pesticide Reporting Beyond Agriculture

Pesticides are applied throughout agricultural operations, residential properties, commercial buildings, parks, roadsides, and other environments integral to daily life.

California and New York provide useful examples of how state reporting systems extend into these environments, while differing considerably in the applications covered, the geographical precision of their records, and the information made available to the public.

© 2026 Evernorth Foundation. All rights reserved.

Table Two | Federal Reporting Framework vs. California and New York

Reporting feature	Federal framework	California	New York
Agricultural applications	Selected records; crop surveys	Comprehensive reporting since 1990	Commercial applications; private-use sales data
Beyond agriculture	Selected regulated uses	Structural; parks; roadsides; golf courses; landscapes	Commercial residential; structural; grounds; public facilities
Reporting format	Retained records; surveys; program reports	Ag: individual records; other uses: monthly summaries	Annual submission; individual commercial applications
Location detail	Application records; selected survey geography	Ag: ~1 sq. mile; other uses: county	Address; ZIP code; specified exceptions
Public accessibility	Statistical estimates; limited individual application access	Searchable database; downloadable records	Annual datasets; public summaries
Coverage limitations	Varying requirements; fragmented scope	Consumer DIY; most industrial and institutional uses	Private-use gaps; incomplete or inaccurate data

Sources: California Department of Pesticide Regulation; New York Department of Environmental Conservation; 40 CFR §171.303; USDA NASS. [1, 3, 8–10]

California's agricultural reporting system documents individual applications with relatively precise geographical information, while many nonagricultural uses are reported through county-level monthly summaries. New York requires commercial applicators to submit annual application reports, although its Department of Environmental Conservation acknowledges limitations in the completeness and accuracy of the resulting data.

These distinctions influence the geographical precision, consistency, and comprehensiveness of the information available for examining pesticide use across the country.

What Detailed Records Make Possible

California's reporting system provides an example of the scientific possibilities created through comprehensive pesticide documentation.

In a 2019 study published in The BMJ, researchers examined 2,961 children diagnosed with autism and used California's pesticide application records to investigate associations between pesticide exposure near maternal residences and autism diagnoses.

The researchers assessed estimated exposures within 2,000 meters of maternal residences during pregnancy. Their findings identified associations involving several pesticides, illustrating how detailed geographical records can support investigations into environmental exposure and human development.

The study was observational, and its findings establish associations rather than proof of causation.

Source: von Ehrenstein et al., The BMJ (2019). [11]

© 2026 Evernorth Foundation. All rights reserved.

Closing Perspective

Pesticide reporting across the United States is dispersed among federal requirements, state programs, applicator records, and statistical surveys. Each contributes a portion of the atlas, yet their differing standards, coverage, and accessibility leave the full extent and geographical distribution of pesticide use difficult to establish.

California and New York demonstrate the possibilities afforded by more comprehensive documentation, particularly when records include the location, quantity, and timing of individual applications. Such information enables scientific investigation, geographical comparisons, and a greater understanding of the chemicals introduced into the environments where we live.

Our technological capabilities have advanced to a point where chemical applications can be documented with remarkable precision, organized across jurisdictions, and examined over time. Meanwhile, scientific research continues to deepen our understanding of pesticide exposure and its implications for humanity. These parallel advancements place a cohesive national account of pesticide use increasingly within reach, with the potential to transform public transparency, scientific inquiry, and regulatory accountability.

For Eli, and for all of humanity.

Sources & References

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 40 CFR §171.303: Requirements for State Certification Plans.
2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 40 CFR §170.311: Pesticide Application and Hazard Information.
3. USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. Agricultural Chemical Use Program.
4. International Agency for Research on Cancer. IARC Monograph on Glyphosate and Evaluation of Organophosphate Pesticides (2015).
5. USDA Agricultural Marketing Service. 2011 Federal Pesticide Recordkeeping Program Annual Summary.
6. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Rescission of Recordkeeping on Restricted Use Pesticides by Certified Applicators, 90 FR 20083 (May 12, 2025; effective July 11, 2025).
7. European Commission. Chlorpyrifos and Chlorpyrifos-methyl: Renewal Decisions and Regulatory Information.
8. California Department of Pesticide Regulation. California Pesticide Information Portal: Agricultural and Nonagricultural Reporting Categories.
9. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Pesticide Recordkeeping and Reporting of Commercial Applicators.
10. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Pesticide Annual Report Data and Limitations.
11. von Ehrenstein, O. S., et al. (2019). Prenatal and Infant Exposure to Ambient Pesticides and Autism Spectrum Disorder in Children. The BMJ, 364, l962.

About the Author

Victoria Vera is the founder of Evernorth Foundation and a research analyst specializing in environmental contaminants, their geographical distribution, and the influence of food, products, materials, and environmental exposures on human wellness.

Suggested Citation

Vera, V. (2026). Pesticide Reporting in the United States: A Concise Overview. Evernorth Foundation. evernorthfoundation.org

© 2026 Evernorth Foundation. All rights reserved.