EXPOSURE OF NON-TARGET VERTEBRATES TO SECOND-GENERATION RODENTICIDES IN BRITAIN, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE POLECAT MUSTELA PUTORIUS

Summary: In Britain, the use of "second-generation" rodenticides has become widespread on agricultural premises. The high toxicity and relatively long half-lives of these compounds has raised concerns over potential secondary exposure and poisoning of non-target predators. Over the last 15 years, exposure has been extensively documented in the barn owl Tyto alba but relatively little is known about mammalian terrestrial predators. This paper reviews recent studies and demonstrates that there is evidence of both secondary exposure and secondary poisoning in a variety of non-target, terrestrial mammals in Britain. It also presents new data on rodenticide levels in the polecat Mustela putorius which preys on farmyard rats in winter in Britain and is, therefore, considered to be highly vulnerable to exposure to rodenticides. The new data demonstrated that 26% of polecats in the sample contained difenacoum or bromadiolone and that exposure was geographically widespread and occurred in several years. The possible effects of secondary exposure on populations of polecats and other predators are discussed.

Keywords: Secondary poisoning; difenacoum; bromadiolone; mustelids; fox.

Introduction

Rodent infestations on agricultural premises are common in Britain (Meyer et al., 1995) and, as a result, use of rodenticides on farms is widespread. A 1992-1993 survey indicated that approximately three-quarters of farms growing grass, arable or fodder crops in Britain controlled rodents with poison (Olney and Garthwaite, 1994; Olney, Thomas and Garthwaite, 1994). Most rodenticides are applied in and around farm buildings to control common rats (Rattus norvegicus Berkenhout) and some are licensed only for use indoors. However, others are also used along hedgerows and in fields to protect crops and feed hoppers from various rodent species (McDonald et al., 1998).

Much of the control on agricultural premises now involves the so-called "second-generation" rodenticides, difenacoum, bromadiolone, brodifacoum and flocoumafen. They were introduced between 1975 and 1985 to replace warfarin, to which rats had become resistant (Cowan et al., 1995). The second-generation rodenticides are approximately 100-1000 times more toxic than warfarin and the other first generation compounds, a single meal of bait being sufficient to kill a rodent (Newton et al., in press). They also have long biological half-lives in tissues such as the liver, (Eason, Wright and Batcheler, 1996; Huckle et al., 1989; Parmar et al., 1987). Both attributes enhance their potential to cause secondary poisoning in predators. Rodents usually die several days after consuming bait containing second-generation compounds and so can be captured and eaten by a predator during this time. Some predators may also scavenge the carcasses of poisoned animals.

In Britain, there are a number of native predatory birds and mammals that feed on rodents in and around agricultural premises. Species about which there is particular concern with regard to secondary poisoning are the barn owl (Tyto alba Scopoli), and the polecat (Mustela putorius L.). Barn Owls have declined in numbers in recent decades (Shawyer, 1987) and the polecat is relatively rare because of persecution in the 19th Century (Langley and Yalden, 1977); until recently it has been restricted in its distribution to Wales (Blandford, 1987; Birks, 1993). Both species have partial or total legal protection in Britain. Other mammals that may feed on rats and other rodents in the vicinity of farms are the weasel (Mustela nivalis Erxleben), stoat (M. erminea L.), mink (M. vison Scheeber) and fox (Vulpes vulpes L.). Because of their foraging habits, all could be potentially exposed to rodenticides by eating contaminated prey. In this paper, we review the evidence that secondary exposure and poisoning...
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Evidence of secondary exposure and poisoning of wild birds and mammals by rodenticides in Britain

Secondary poisoning by rodenticides was considered to be a hazard for wild vertebrate predators in Britain as long ago as the 1960s. Walton (1970) suggested that poisoning of polecats by anticoagulants, largely warfarin at that time, was a common occurrence around farmyards. There was little field evidence to support this, possibly because polecats die out of sight and are rarely found (Birks, 1998). Subsequent experimental studies on weasels, however, did confirm that secondary poisoning by warfarin could occur in mustelids (Townsend et al., 1984).

The issue of secondary exposure and poisoning by second-generation rodenticides was highlighted in Britain in the 1980s by a long-term study in which residues were detected in barn owl carcasses that had been collected from throughout the country as part of a national Predatory Bird Monitoring Scheme (Newton, Wyllie and Freestone, 1990). This scheme is still going on and, in a recent review of the data, it was calculated that the proportion of carcasses which contained detectable residues had increased from 5% in 1983-84 to 36% in 1995-96 and may be reaching steady-state (Newton et al., in press). Investigations in other countries in the 1980s also indicated the potential for secondary exposure and poisoning of raptors by second-generation rodenticides (Duckett, 1984; Hegdal and Blaskiewicz, 1984; Hegdal and Colvin, 1988; Mendenhall and Pank, 1980; Merson, Byers and Kaukeinen, 1984).

The demonstration of widespread exposure in barn owls prompted concern that free-living mammalian predators, in particular small mustelids, may be similarly exposed and at risk from secondary poisoning. There have been two recent British studies of the levels of rodenticides in mustelids. In the first, 29 polecat carcasses, mostly traffic casualties, were collected between 1992 and 1994 and 31% contained detectable residues of second-generation rodenticides (Shore et al., 1996). In the second survey, first and second generation rodenticides were detected in nine out of 40 stoats (23%) and three out of ten weasels (30%) which had been trapped or shot (McDonald et al., 1998). Thus, both mustelid surveys and the barn owl study indicated that some 25-35% of the animals examined had been exposed to rodenticides.

Determining whether secondary poisoning occurs in free-living vertebrates is difficult because it requires the discovery of animals that died as a result of exposure. Using both post-mortem examination and quantification of liver residues, it was demonstrated that some barn owls collected for the Predatory Bird Monitoring Scheme were poisoned by second-generation rodenticides (Newton et al., in press). Secondary poisoning of free-living mustelids has been demonstrated in New Zealand (Alterio, 1996; Alterio, Brown and Moller, 1997; Brown, Alterio and Moller, 1998) but was a result of large-scale field applications of bromifacoum, a usage pattern not employed in Britain. As far as we are aware, the only documented evidence of secondary poisoning by second-generation rodenticides in mustelids in Britain is from a single polecat that died while being radio-tracked (Birks, 1998). It had a liver difenacoum residue of 1.4 µg g⁻¹ and was diagnosed as having died from difenacoum poisoning (Fletcher, Hunter and Barnett, 1994). The residue studies by Shore et al. (1996) and McDonald et al. (1998) had sampling methods that made unlikely and precluded respectively the collection of poisoned animals. Thus, they were not designed to determine if secondary poisoning occurred. They did show that some individuals survived exposure to rodenticides, at least until they were killed by other causes.

However, five animals (two stoats, two polecats, one weasel) had bromadiolone concentrations of between 0.12 and 0.38 µg g⁻¹, similar to that (0.23 µg g⁻¹) detected in an experimentally poisoned stoat (Grolleau, Lorgue and Nahas, 1989). The occurrence of such residues suggests that secondary poisoning of some mustelids in Britain is likely, although we have no means of knowing what percentage of exposures are fatal.

There is one further source of evidence that indicates secondary poisoning does occur in predatory mammals in Britain. The UK Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries runs a Wildlife Incident Investigation Scheme (WIIS), the aim of which is to investigate incidents of wildlife mortality and to determine whether pesticides are implicated. A post-mortem examination is carried out on animals submitted to the WIIS and, when appropriate, chemical analyses of specific body tissues are also conducted. Examination of the WIIS annual reports for the 1990s indicated that there have been incidents in which companion animals and a wide range of wild mammals have been poisoned by rodenticides (Table 1). Some of these incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Species poisoned</th>
<th>Number of fox incidents</th>
<th>Incidents in which foxes were poisoned by rodenticides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>fox, dog, cat</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>fox, badger, rabbit, grey squirrel, dog, cat</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>fox, badger, hedgehog, grey squirrel, dog, cat</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>fox, polecat, grey squirrel, cat, dog, pig</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>fox, badger, rabbit, dog, cat</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>fox, grey squirrel, dog, cat</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>fox, badger, rabbit, dog, cat, pig</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

involved misuse or abuse of pesticides and others may have been due to primary poisoning but some of the incidents in predators were thought to have been due to secondary poisoning.

Therefore, the WIIS provides evidence that secondary poisoning does occur in various predators. The almost complete absence of small mustelids from the data was probably because few individuals were submitted to the scheme and is not an indication that poisoning does not occur in these species. The most striking aspect of the species list in Table 1 is the consistency with which the fox appears (Table 1). A survey of animals found dead in France also indicated that foxes are poisoned by rodenticides (Berny et al., 1997). Of the fox incidents investigated each year by the WIIS, approximately 15-40% were pesticide-related and the number of pesticide poisonings that involved rodenticides varied from 25% in 1990 and 1991 to 100% in 1992 (Table 1). Overall, poisoning by rodenticides accounted for some 5-20% of all incidents investigated each year. These figures do not represent the proportion of the fox population that dies from rodenticide poisoning, because individuals suspected of dying from causes unrelated to pesticides are not submitted to the WIIS.

Evidence of secondary exposure of polecats to second-generation rodenticides

Polecats are strictly carnivorous (Blandford, 1987) and primary exposure to rodenticides, through direct take of bait, is improbable. Thus, exposure in this species is almost certain to be secondary and result mainly from consumption of poisoned rodents. Some exposure may also occur from eating lagomorphs, which can be exposed to rodenticides (see Table 1), and possibly through scavenging the carcasses of poisoned animals. Of all British mammals, polecats are arguably the most likely to be secondarily exposed to rodenticides because they actively hunt farmyard rodents in winter. Birks (1998) carried out a radio-tracking study on eleven polecats and found that ten of the animals visited agricultural premises during the period from September to March, the time when rats are most abundant on farms. Analysis of scats indicated that common rats made up 65% of the polecat diet at that time. It is because of their reliance on farmyard rats as winter food and because of their relative rarity in Britain that we have concentrated upon polecats in our studies of secondary exposure to rodenticides.

In the survey of polecat carcasses that we conducted previously (Shore et al., 1996), the livers of 24 animals were analysed for second-generation rodenticides. A second study, in which the livers of another 26 adult animals (19 males, 7 females) were analysed for the same compounds, has now been carried out. As in the first study, almost all of the animals in the second study were killed on the roads; the cause of death of one animal was unknown. The methods of carcass collection and chemical analysis of the liver were the same in the two surveys and are fully described by Shore et al. (1996). Residues were corrected for column recoveries (65%) in the second survey so as to make them compatible with data from the first survey. Limits of detection in the second survey were the same as those in the first (see Shore et al., 1996) except for a slight improvement for bromadiolone (0.013 µg in the whole sample). For the purposes of the present paper, data from the two surveys were combined to assess overall temporal and geographical trends in residue distribution.
The results of the surveys (Table 2) were that second-generation rodenticides were detected in 13 of the 50 livers analysed (26%). Difenacoum and bromadiolone were the predominant compounds, occurring in 16% and 14% of animals respectively, whereas bromifacoum was only found in one polecat and flocoumafen was not detected at all. More than one compound was present in two animals, suggesting that multiple exposure does occur. Males were more numerous in the sample but both sexes appeared equally likely to be exposed to rodenticides; 9 of the 34 males (26%) and 4 of the 16 females (25%) contained residues (Table 2). Examination of the geographical distribution of residues revealed that contaminated polecats came from various counties (Fig. 1), indicating that exposure was not a localised occurrence. A breakdown of the data by month (different years combined) showed that, although the sample contained polecats which had died in every month except December, residues were largely only found in animals killed between November and April (Fig. 2). When the year was divided on a calendar basis into the three 4-month periods, the ratio of contaminated to uncontaminated animals in January-April was 10:12 compared with 1:8 in May-August and 2:17 in September-December; these ratios were significantly different from each other (\(X^2 = 7.73, P<0.05\)). When data were analysed on an annual basis, it was evident that exposure occurred in several years but not in all (Fig. 3). Most notably, residues were not found in animals killed in 1995. This may simply have been a result of random variation. It did not appear to be due to any bias in the time when carcasses were collected as the proportion of polecats from the winter and spring months, when residues were usually detected, was not particularly low in 1995 (Fig. 3).

The findings from the analysis of 50 animals are consistent with and, because they are based on a larger sample, add confidence to the conclusions drawn from the first survey (Shore et al., 1996). It is evident that exposure of polecats to second-generation rodenticides is geographically widespread and occurs repeatedly. The rodenticides detected in the liver reflect usage patterns, difenacoum and bromadiolone being the second-generation rodenticides most widely applied on British farms (Olney and Garthwaite, 1994; Olney et al., 1994).
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Figure 1: The numbers of polecats with (shaded bars) and without (open bars) detectable residues of second-generation rodenticides collected in Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Warwickshire, Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire and Buckinghamshire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal code</th>
<th>Date carcass located</th>
<th>Location (county)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Rodenticide concentration (µg g⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/4/94</td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/94</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P42/94</td>
<td>25/94</td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P43/94</td>
<td>31/94</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15/93</td>
<td>3/94</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26/94</td>
<td>12/94</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23/93</td>
<td>12/94</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/11/94</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P173/94</td>
<td>31/11/94</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18/96</td>
<td>13/06/96</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14/97</td>
<td>3/03/97</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25/97</td>
<td>1/04/97</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P27/97</td>
<td>9/02/97</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Rodenticide residues in polecats. ND = not detected. Residues were not detected in the livers of the other 37 animals analysed. Flocoumafen was not detected in any of the livers. Data from first survey are from Shore et al. (1996).
The prevalence of rodenticides in animals killed in winter and early spring most probably reflects the fact that polecats are exposed to rodenticides when they hunt on farms in early winter and are then killed on roads in subsequent months when they disperse into the wider landscape. Elimination of rodenticides from the liver is biphasic in mammals with a rapid initial phase lasting two to eight days after exposure and a slower terminal phase in which the elimination half-life exceeds 100 days (World Health Organisation, 1995). Thus, it is likely that residues would be detected in polecats several months after exposure. It is uncertain whether the general lack of detectable rodenticide in animals killed between May and October indicates that residues accumulated in the previous winter are largely metabolised and eliminated by this time, some fifteen months after the main exposure period. The duration over which rodenticides remain detectable in polecats will vary with time and extent of exposure, amongst other factors. Other causes, such as sampling different sub-sets of animals in different seasons, cannot be ruled out.

Overall, it is surprising that the proportion of individuals contaminated with rodenticides appears to be so similar in polecats, stoats, weasels and barn owls, given that the polecats has a closer association with farms and their rats than at least the other mustelids (Corbet and Harris, 1991). It is possible that direct comparison of the stoat and weasel data with those for polecats is biased by differences in methodology. Stoats and weasels were analysed for six (first and second generation) rodenticides and came largely from eastern England (McDonald et al., 1998), whereas polecats were analysed only for four second-generation rodenticides and were predominantly from western counties, where rodenticides are used less intensely. Had stoats and weasels been taken from the same areas as polecats
and analysed only for the same compounds, the proportion of animals with detectable residues may have been lower. However, this does not appear to be the case with barn owls. Direct comparison of, albeit limited, data for owls and polecats collected in the same years and region and chemically analysed by identical methods indicated that the percentage of contaminated animals did not differ significantly between the two species (Newton et al., in press). Thus, there is no evidence to suggest that polecats and barn owls differ in their levels of exposure to second-generation rodenticides.

It is arguable that surveys of rodenticide residues in road-killed and trapped animals may underestimate the true level of exposure. This is because animals that have ingested a lethal dose of rodenticide are under-represented. This will also be true for surveys of carcasses found by the public if animals die in places where they are not easily found. Under-estimation of exposure may be especially pronounced in polecat samples collected throughout the year because of the seasonality of exposure. In the study by Birks (1998), five of the eleven (45%) radio-tracked animals made "heavy use" of farmyards in which rodenticides were applied and were considered vulnerable to secondary exposure. If that small sample was representative of the whole population, the true level of exposure would appear to be almost twice that detected in the present polecat carcass survey. Interestingly, if polecats killed between May and October are excluded from the carcass survey data, because it is assumed that residues accumulated in the previous winter have been eliminated, the percentage of contaminated individuals in the sample increases to 46%, the same as indicated by the radio-tracking study. Clearly, the exposure to, and subsequent pharmacokinetics of, second-generation rodenticides in polecats need to be quantified so that survey data can be interpreted with greater accuracy.

Effects of rodenticides on wildlife populations in Britain

There are few data with which to assess the effects of rodenticides on populations. Newton et al. (in press) found that less than 2% of individuals examined in the barn owl survey had died from poisoning by second-generation rodenticides and concluded that there was currently no evidence that rodenticides seriously affected population levels. For mustelids, there is no evidence from the WIHS of any widespread mortality of stoats, weasels or polecats although poisoned animals may not be found. It is not known whether the 9% level of secondary poisoning amongst the 11 polecats studied by Birks (1998) is at all representative of rodicide poisonings in the whole polecat population. However, polecats are expanding their range in Britain (Birks, 1993), indicating that, whatever mortality may be caused by anticoagulants, it is not sufficient to prevent population expansion at present. Whether rodenticides will affect the ability of polecats to recolonise eastern areas of Britain, where rodenticide use is heavier, remains to be seen.

Conclusions

The data reviewed and presented in this paper indicate that at least 25-35% of individuals in populations of small mammal predators are secondarily exposed to rodenticides in Britain. It is possible that this is an underestimate. Exposure of barn owls and polecats has been shown to be geographically widespread, occurs in many years and matches rodenticide usage patterns.

Secondary poisoning, rather than just exposure, has also been recorded in various small mammal predators in Britain. However, there is little understanding of the frequency with which this occurs in mammals or its importance compared with other causes of mortality. Studies are needed to assess the magnitude and frequency of rodenticide intake by small mammal predators and to determine the toxic effects of this exposure. It is only with such data that the importance of secondary poisoning on populations can be estimated. Any such estimates should be validated by field studies. Furthermore, given the widespread occurrence of low-level exposure and the lack of knowledge about what effects this may have, physiological and behavioural studies on the effects of sub-lethal exposure in predators are also much needed.
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