

David S. Wall
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [(408)-287-6878]

Via Electronic Mail

March 26, 2019

To: House Committee on Agriculture and Land Use; **Representatives** Noble; Post; **Senator**: Thatcher;
Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources

Re: Issues: Prohibition of Chlorpyrifos, Pesticide Reporting, Reexamination fee, Qualifying licenses

[HB 3058]: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB3058/Introduced>

[SB 853]: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB853/Introduced>

[HB 2980]: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB2980/Introduced>

[HB 2058]: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB2058/Introduced>

[SB 854]: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB854>

[SB 855]: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB855/Introduced>

Consider: Combine and consolidate all of the aforementioned bills into one coherent piece of legislation.

[HB 3058] and [SB 853] are almost mirror images of one another. Both bills prohibit the sale of the organophosphate pesticide "Chlopyrifos" but, the Senate Bill amends "pesticide registration fee" and "reduces maximum fee for certain occupational licenses related to pesticides." Both House and Senate Bills intent is to place all "neonictinoid pesticides" under "restricted use."

I have concerns with certain elements of [SB 853]. Clarification is needed on how [SB 854] and [SB 855] will be interpreted and or applied to the licensing requirements for pesticide applicators and or consultants.

[SB 854] states, "Directs professional licensing Boards, in certain circumstances, to accept "individual taxpayer identification number" or other "Federally-issued identification number" in lieu of "Social Security number" on applications for issuance or renewal of authorization to practice occupation or profession."

[SB 855] states: "Directs professional licensing Boards, to develop pathways of licensure, certification or other authorization to practice occupation or profession for specified persons." Both [SB 854] and [SB 855] may have deleterious effects on licensure and certification for "pesticide applicator" and or "pesticide consultant" professions and who gets access and authorization to "restricted use pesticides." Can and will "illegal aliens" obtain "pathways" to licensure, certification or other authorization procedures to become "pesticide applicators" and or "pesticide consultants" thereby gaining access to "restricted use pesticides?"

[HB 2980] states, "Extends sunset date of pesticide use reporting system." Should the "pesticide use reporting system" be periodically reviewed, made current and have "No" sunset date? I think so.

[HB 2058] states, "Relating to the charging of reexamination fees to applicants for licensing in pesticide trades. Eliminates reexamination fee for pesticide applicator and pesticide consultants." This is wrong. ***There should be a significant reexamination fee for failure and here is why:*** One of my neighbors is a licensed "pesticide applicator" having access to "restricted use pesticides." This neighbor informed me upon questioning as to licensure, "There is only one test. If you fail the test, all you have to do is review your wrong answers and retake the test as many times as you need to pass the test and receive your license." I do not know if this is a true statement or just a "joking" one but, a thorough and complete review of testing content and methodologies (like having multiple tests and only giving out scores and not answers) must occur to prevent the possibility of applicants who haven't the education and requisite knowledge of the chemistry and biology of pesticides and the dangers of misuse is troublesome and should be immediately remedied if found defective.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ David S. Wall

David S. Wall
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [(408)-287-6878]