VIII. CHEMICALS

General Chemical Statement 8.005
1 The state chemical laws and rules must be built on a sound basis that
2 recognizes the general benefit to agriculture. (07)

Agricultural Chemical Liability 8.010
1 We support legislation exempting producers, who apply pesticides
2 properly, from liability claims for environmental pollution.
3 Because federal or state regulatory agencies have the power to levy
4 fines and enforce the laws concerning agricultural chemical misuse,
5 private citizens should not be allowed any monetary gains from the
6 proceedings.
7 We urge that state and national legislation be enacted to:
8 1. Require that individuals or groups that file injunctions against the
9 proper use of registered chemicals should reimburse farmers,
10 timber growers, contractors, federal, state and county
11 governments for all court costs, legal fees, financial losses and
12 other costs that arise from an injunction if the injunction is shown
13 to be unfounded or is overturned in a court of law.
14 2. Require a bond guaranteeing payment of aforementioned filing
15 the complaint, in an amount to be set by the court and subject to
16 review upon motion by defense counsel and increase in amount if
17 the court finds appropriate after conducting a hearing thereon.
18 3. Compliance with federally approved label instructions should
19 absolve farmers from liability claims of environmental pollution.
(10)

Chemical Use Criteria 8.020
1 Criteria used to establish or prohibit domestic and foreign use of an
2 agricultural chemical should be uniform and equitable.
3 We also oppose any system which is funded by a tax or surcharge on
4 pesticides, farmer or farming operations. Any such system should be
5 funded from the General Fund so the cost is shared by all taxpayers. (10)

Agricultural and Forest Chemicals 8.040
1 Agricultural chemicals are an essential tool of agricultural production.
2 We support reasonable regulation of their use. We support an expanded
3 program to inform and educate the public on the need for agricultural
4 chemicals and the protection against their misuse.
5 We believe implementation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and
6 Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended, based on credible scientific
7 information would benefit farmers, the environment and the public.
We support improved training programs on the proper handling and safe use of pesticides. We believe that the EPA/state pesticide applicator training and certification programs should be periodically upgraded to ensure they are a sound and effective source of training and information. We support improved safety information on labels of agricultural chemicals. Expanded information on labels concerning poison control centers, medical information, worker protection and possible adverse environmental effects will assist farmers to better protect themselves and the environment.

We recommend that compliance with federally approved label instructions should absolve farmers from liability claims of environmental pollution. We support added training requirements to address dissipation of chemicals (drift and volatilization) to the core pesticide training program. Training should also include education regarding application timing to prevent damage to non-target plants. This training should be prepared and delivered by the Oregon State University Extension Service or a specific program approved by the Oregon Department of Agriculture to insure credibility.

To avoid the use of ineffective pesticides, we believe a labeling system covering the date of manufacture; effective life and proper storage requirements must be required.

We encourage continued research and development of pesticides which degrade more rapidly, are less environmentally persistent and are compatible with accepted integrated pest management practices. We support the environmental and economical concept of integrated pest management.

We support expanded biological pest control research to determine where biological pest control measures can provide practical and feasible substitutes for, and supplements to, chemical controls.

We urge that chemicals cleared for use on edible food crops to control a specific pest be automatically cleared for control of the same pest on ornamental and other seed crops.

Provisions providing for experimental use, emergency exemptions and state registration are particularly important until federal registration are completed.

We oppose any curtailment of the safe and proper use of agricultural chemicals and drugs unless research and scientific data determine that injury to health and wellbeing would result. We also request reevaluation of previously canceled pesticides based on current scientific data.

We will work with and encourage the agricultural chemical industry to present through its advertising a positive and professional image of farmers and agriculture to the general public.

We oppose politically mandated buffer zones.
We support the use of vegetable oils as the base or carrier for pesticides and herbicides and also in the development of practical equipment for farm applications.

We recommend the agricultural chemical industry and agricultural producers work with the appropriate state agencies to develop a durable and safe container and an economical and logistically feasible plan for reusable pesticide containers and for disposal of pesticide containers.

We oppose the inclusion of a "Private Right of Action" provision in the statutes.

We support the use of maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) in establishing drinking water standards for pesticides and urge that EPA expedite the standard setting process.

No food product should be imported into the United States from countries which allow the use of agricultural chemicals or pharmaceutical products that the American farmer is prohibited from using. Food products treated with agricultural chemicals in foreign countries should not be imported unless those chemicals are registered for use in the United States.

We support the use of approved pesticides for timber production management. Landowners should be guaranteed the right to use approved management practices in forestry zones. (05), (10)

**Pesticides**

We support the use of pesticides as an essential tool of agriculture and forestry. We support the American Farm Bureau Federation pesticide policy and the extension of that policy to Oregon State laws and regulations. We support an expanded program to inform and educate the public using more positive terms, stressing the need for agricultural chemicals for the health and protection of our plants and animals.

We support reasonable legislation that does not require more records to be kept than are required by the federal government for noncommercial restricted use pesticide applicator for two years. These records should only be released to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, and only after a specific need their release has been demonstrated to exist. Reasons for the release of application records from the noncommercial applicator may include such things as illegal restricted use pesticide usage, pesticide contamination of groundwater or a documented complaint.

We believe the existing means of tracking the sales and use of agricultural pesticides in the state is adequate and we oppose any system which identifies individual growers or farming operations or makes available their pesticide use records to the public.

Any public "pesticide right to know" legislation would be inadequate without a complete accounting of all pesticides used by every individual household. Any legislation should also require a provision to insist that anyone who purchases or applies pesticides should meet the
requirements established for agriculture by FIFRA, WPS, EPA and the
State of Oregon. 24
We also oppose any system which is funded by a tax or surcharge on
pesticides, farmer or farming operations. Any such system should be
funded from the General Fund so the cost is shared by all taxpayers. (09),
(10)

Certification and Education 8.051
We support improved training programs on the proper handling and
safe use of pesticides. We believe that the EPA/state pesticide applicator
training and certification programs should be periodically upgraded to
ensure they are a sound and effective source of training and information.
We support added training requirements to address dissipation of
chemicals (drift and volatilization) to the core pesticide training program.
Training should also include education regarding application timing to
prevent damage to non-target plants. This training should be prepared and
delivered by the Oregon State University Extension Service or a specific
program approved by the Oregon Department of Agriculture to insure
credibility.
We support an expanded program to inform and educate the public
using more positive terms, stressing the need for agricultural chemicals for
the health and protection of our plants and animals. (10)

Pesticide Sales and Use Reporting 8.052
We support an alternate paper reporting system for reporting pesticide
use.
We will only support extension of the Pesticide Use Reporting System
if all general public retail sales are also required to be reported in the
system. (02), (06)
We support reasonable legislation that does not require more records
to be kept than are required by the federal government for noncommercial
restricted use pesticide applicator for two years. These records should
only be released to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, and only after
a specific need their release has been demonstrated to exist. Reasons for
the release of application records from the noncommercial applicator may
include such things as illegal restricted use pesticide usage, pesticide
contamination of groundwater or a documented complaint.
We believe the existing means of tracking the sales and use of
agricultural pesticides in the state is adequate and we oppose any system
which identifies individual growers or farming operations or makes
available their pesticide use records to the public.
Any public "pesticide right to know" legislation would be inadequate
without a complete accounting of all pesticides used by every individual
household. Any legislation should also require a provision to insist that
anyone who purchases or applies pesticides should meet the
requirements established for agriculture by FIFRA, WPS, EPA and the
State of Oregon. (10)

**Pesticide Labels**

1. To avoid the use of ineffective pesticides, we believe a labeling system
covering the date of manufacture; effective life and proper storage
requirements must be required.
2. We support improved safety information on labels of agricultural
chemicals. Expanded information on labels concerning poison control
centers, medical information, worker protection and possible adverse
environmental effects will assist farmers to better protect themselves and
the environment. (10)

**The Food Quality Protection Act**

1. All legislation that requires review of chemical exposure risks should
incorporate the following elements:
   1. Ample time for data collection, including a use pattern, application
   rates, and other relevant exposure rates.
   2. An allowance for minor crop uses:
   3. A top priority for streamlining the Section 18 registration process
   so products are quickly and readily available for emergency use;
   4. Incentives for registrants to register new products and reduced
   risk products for minor crop, food and non-food uses; and
   5. A requirement that growers are consulted prior to the cancellation
   of chemicals used in agriculture.
2. USDA must be an active partner in the regulation of chemicals in
agriculture.
3. USDA must be encouraged to continue working as an advocate for
farmers by collecting and disseminating essential chemical use and
residue information, especially for the minor crops, both food and non-
food.
4. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and other advanced crop
protection techniques help to reduce overall chemical use. IPM programs
are weakened when chemicals that target specific pests are lost. The EPA
and USDA should consider the impact on lost IPM use when deciding
whether or not to reregister a product for agricultural use.
5. Research must be promoted that accurately identifies exposure risks
to consumers of food and other horticultural products.
6. Implementation of any food quality regulations must rely on accurate
and adequate scientific data which precisely quantifies the risk exposure
levels and the benefits of agricultural products. New regulations should not
be implemented until all available scientific information and use data are
collected and evaluated. Any statutory deadlines deemed unreasonable
should be changed.
7. We support legislative solutions to ensure the availability of minor crop
use pesticides. These solutions should include, but not be limited to,
86 expanded IR-4 activities, tax credits to registrants who maintain these uses, and reduced third party registration liability.

**Purple Loosestrife Control Research** 8.060
1. We encourage the American Farm Bureau Federation to lobby for federal funding for the Cornell Research Team to continue importation and testing of biological control agents of Purple Loosestrife for release in the United States.
2. We encourage the Oregon State legislature to provide funding to continue biological and chemical control research and complete field surveys being conducted by the Oregon Department of Agriculture and Oregon State University.

**Chlorofluorocarbon Exemption** 8.070
1. Agriculture should be given an exemption to the 1996 phase-out of chlorofluorocarbons.
2. We encourage the retention and use of Freon or other feasible, economical types of coolants.

**Restricted Chemicals** 8.080
1. Provisions should be made for the use of restricted chemicals when no effective alternatives are available. Protection of food production and forestry resources should have priority over limited environmental consideration.
2. We support reasonable regulation of restricted chemicals, but restrictions should be based on residue and toxicity rather than for use on specific crops.

**Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration (RPAR)** 8.085
1. In order to establish an orderly manner of reassessing and re registering agricultural chemicals, and to develop and maintain an adequate number of these same chemical tools necessary to agricultural production, we support Oregon’s RPAR Response Team by the following action:
2. Notifying our county Farm Bureaus and through them our county Farm Bureau members of the eminent danger of loss of use of agricultural chemicals posed by EPA through the established RPAR process.
3. Request development of an active program of communication with EPA, our Congressional delegation, and our RPAR team (This means at least 5 copies of each letter).
4. Obtain all possible media publicity on the plight we face should EPA not adopt a reasonable attitude on RPAR.
5. We urge that the burden of proof in support of, or in opposition to, use of agricultural chemicals be placed upon the scientific community and not upon individuals, as hearings continue for RPAR.
Food Quality 8.100
1 We support the production and marketing of pure, wholesome food. Modern agriculture cannot continue to provide sufficient quantities of high quality food, fiber and other agricultural products to meet the nation's needs without the judicious use of agricultural chemicals and drugs. Any undue curtailment of the safe and appropriate usage of these products will result in lower quality and/or quantities of food and fiber at higher costs to consumers.
2 In any evaluation of chemicals and drugs, the possible detrimental effects must be considered in relation to the benefits derived. We support the establishment of sound research criteria for the range and dosage levels to be tested, the replication needed for valid results, the use of animals as subjects in the research and the determination of applicability of the results to humans. A direct correlation between artificial exposure to carcinogens and ill effects, as compared with natural exposure, should be proven before an additive is deemed unsafe.
3 All legislative and regulatory decisions on food irradiation should be based on valid research including safe levels of usage on food products. Irradiation should be defined as a food process and not a food additive.
4 We support legislation to require qualified people to prepare and publish in advance of final rulemaking an agricultural cost benefit analysis statement on proposed regulations having a significant effect upon agricultural producers.
5 We support uniformity in pesticide residue standards. States should not be allowed to establish residue tolerances which differ from those set by the federal Environmental Protection Agency.
6 Pesticide residue tolerances established for imported raw and processed agricultural commodities should be identical to those set for domestically produced agricultural commodities.
7 We encourage increased frequency of the USDA inspection of foreign raw produce imports to guarantee chemical use safety and equality.
8 We support legislation to create a study commission of highly competent, non-crusading scientists to conduct an in-depth study of the current situation regarding the detection and assessment of carcinogens.

Medical History and Pesticides 8.200
1 We actively seek a mandate from EPA (and other decision-making agencies) to study the medical history and background of users and their families as a part of the data assessed in determining the safety of pesticides (both those currently being used and those pesticides which have a history of use within the past 15 years).

Industrial and Municipal Waste 8.300
1 We support the need for reasonable legislation for developing proper disposal methods of solid wastes.
The producer of municipal or industrial waste should provide disclosure (i.e. "truth in labeling") on all waste products applied to all lands. We oppose the placement of municipal bio-solids on agricultural land unless applied in a safe and appropriate manner that includes involvement of both local and state agencies and notification of neighboring landowners.

**Bottle Bill Law** 8.320
1. We support the Bottle Bill being expanded to include all glass, plastic, and aluminum carbonated and non-carbonated beverage containers and increase the deposit to 10 cents. (06)

**Recycling of Pesticide Containers** 8.330
1. Empty pesticide containers made of plastic or steel that are one gallon or larger and that are triple rinsed on the farm should be returnable to the dealer of origin or other disposal and recycling sites that have a controlled access.
2. We support the efforts in cooperation with the Oregon Agricultural Chemical Association and the DEQ in the voluntary program to get empty pesticide containers off the farm.

**Air and Water Pollution** 8.400
1. Water and air pollution are serious problems affecting farmers and rural communities. Extensive research and education are important in the development of practical private, local and state programs of abatement.
2. Emphasis should be placed on mutual understanding of the relationship between agricultural operations and water and air quality.
3. We support maintenance of the agricultural exemption in the Air Pollution Act, and the abolishment of DEQs proposed inspection and maintenance program.

**Federal Section 319 Fund Advisory Committee** 8.405
1. We support the appointment of an advisory and review committee by the Environmental Quality Commission. The committee should be composed of potential non-point source pollution stakeholders to review, evaluate, prioritize, and make recommendations to the department and commission on all Section 319 grant applications.

**Underground Storage Tanks** 8.410
1. The Underground Storage Tank (UST) State Insurance Fund should be funded by:
2. 1. Generators of hazardous waste materials;
3. 2. The oil over charge refund revenues, and
4. 3. Fees on underground storage tanks.
The state should create the option of supplementing or supporting private insurance companies as an incentive to encourage private insurance to offer this coverage. Proper tank installation ought to be assured by passing a DEQ certified inspection. Installation should not be restricted to a licensed contractor.