To: House Committee on Agriculture and Land Use
Chair Clem
Vice Chair McClain
Vice Chair Post
Rep. Boshart Davis
Rep. Helm
Rep. Brock Smith
Rep. Williams

From: Bob Van Dyk, Wild Salmon Center

Date: March 25, 2019

**RE: Support for HB 3058 re: restrictions on chlorpyrifos and neonicotinoids**

Chair Clem and Members of the Committee:

For the record, my name is Bob Van Dyk, and I lead the Oregon policy efforts for the Wild Salmon Center. Wild Salmon Center works with partners to conserve healthy wild salmon fisheries across the North Pacific.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony in support of HB 3058, which prohibits the use of chlorpyrifos and limits the use of neonicotinoid insecticides to licensed applicators.

We believe the record regarding these pesticides is sufficient to support the restrictions proposed in HB 3058.

Regarding the revocation of licenses for products containing chlorpyrifos, we call your attention to the negative effects of chlorpyrifos on salmonids.[1] For example, for Oregon Coast coho, which are listed as threatened with extinction under the Endangered Species Act, NOAA concluded the following:

> Given the life history of Oregon Coast coho salmon, we expect the proposed uses of chlorpyrifos, diazinon, and malathion pesticide products that contaminate aquatic habitats may lead to both individual fitness level consequences and subsequent population level consequences, i.e., reductions in population viability. The widespread uses of these materials indicate substantial overlap with the 11

[1] U.S. EPA. Chlorpyrifos Analysis of Risks to Endangered and Threatened Salmon and Steelhead. Office of Pesticide Programs. Cited in National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008. pp. 269-271. See also National Marine Fisheries Service. 2017. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Final Biological Opinion: Environmental Protection Agency's Registration of Pesticides Containing Chlorpyrifos, Diazinon and Malathion, p. B-16.

INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
721 NW Ninth Avenue, Suite 300 • Portland, Oregon 97209 USA • tel: 503.222.1804 • fax: 503.222.1805
info@wildsalmoncenter.org • www.wildsalmoncenter.org

> populations that comprise the Oregon Coast coho salmon. *The risk to this species' survival and recovery from the stressors of the action is high.*[2]

Other studies have reached conclusions regarding the threat of chlorpyrifos to aquatic organisms.[3] Given the wide range of stressors on Pacific salmonids, we support a precautionary approach to the use of chlorpyrifos, and thus support the prohibition implemented by HB 3058.

Similarly, the changed categorization of neonicotinoids proposed in HB 3058 is a prudent measure given the growing scientific record regarding the wide variety of potential negative effects from this insecticide**.** As 30 scientists recommended in the recent "Conclusions of the Worldwide Integrated Assessment on the Risks of Neonicotinoids and Fipronil to Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning,"[4]

> regulatory agencies [should] consider applying the principles of prevention and precaution to further tighten regulations on neonicotinoids and fipronil and consider formulating plans for a substantial reduction of the global scale of use. [5]

HB 3058 would not ban this insecticide, but simply move it to a more appropriate category that requires training to ensure proper use. We support that approach.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this important matter.

---

[2] Ibid, p. 366. Emphasis added.

[3] Sandahl J., Baldwin D., et. al. 2004. Odor-evoked field potentials as indicators of sublethal neurotoxicity in juvenile coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) exposed to copper, chlorpyrifos, or esfenvalerate. Canadian Journal of Fisheries Aquatic Sciences 64:404-413. See also Sandahl J., Baldwin D. et. al. 2005. Comparative thresholds for acetylcholinesterase inhibition and behavioral impairment in coho salmon exposed to chlorpyrifos. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 24:136-145.

[4] J. P. van der Sluijs, et. al. 2015. Conclusions of the Worldwide Integrated Assessment on the Risks of Neonicotinoids and Fipronil to Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 22:148–154

[5] Ibid at p. 153.