

From: Jeff Stone
To: [SENR Exhibits](#); [Sen Dembrow](#); [Sen Baertschiger](#); [Sen Olsen](#); [Sen Prozanski](#); [Sen Roblan](#)
Cc: [Scott Dahlman](#); [Jeff Stone](#); [Elizabeth Remley](#)
Subject: OAN testimony - SB 928 & SB 929 - clarification from the testimony I provided yesterday
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 8:30:52 AM

Good morning committee members

I wanted to apologize for my slight confusion over study in Australia yesterday during the questioning by Senator Prozanski. I am happy to provide you all with my talking points for the testimony – which I shortened considerably in order to save time for all the folks who wished to testify. It is not an excuse for a disjointed answer – but I take enormous pride on being accurate and cogent when I provide the association’s point of view on an issue.

The three issues I wish to clarify

1. Australia study. In Australia, where the Varroa mite is not present and where neonicotinoids are extensively used, the bee health situation is informative. In its recent 92-page report, the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority examined the impact of that country’s extensive use of neonicotinoids, concluding;
“...the introduction of the neonicotinoids has led to an overall reduction in the risks to the agricultural environment from the application of insecticides” and that “Australian honeybee populations are not in decline, despite the increased use of this group of insecticides in agriculture and horticulture since the mid-1990s.”⁴
2. Use of one of the more recent studies: In 2015, results from a three-year bee study conducted by scientists from the University of Maryland, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture confirmed what other research has already shown – that field-relevant exposures of neonicotinoids have negligible effects on honey bee colony health.
3. I made a statement that we need to wait until the train gets into the station regarding information – and on further reflection could have been inferred I meant research data. I accidentally conflated my comments on research with what I actually was trying to get across – which was, while the legislation’s authors may have had good intent on filing these bills, it was my opinion that the state should wait for EPA’s assessment of these class of chemicals and render a nationwide adjustment and not put Oregon at a disadvantage.

I hope that these clarifications are helpful.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Jeff

From: Miles Pengilly [mailto:mpengilly@thornrun.com]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 10:44 AM
To: senr.exhibits@oregonlegislature.gov; Sen Dembrow
<Sen.MichaelDembrow@oregonlegislature.gov>; Sen Baertschiger

<Sen.HermanBaertschiger@oregonlegislature.gov>; Sen Olsen
<Sen.AlanOlsen@oregonlegislature.gov>; Sen Prozanski
<Sen.FloydProzanski@oregonlegislature.gov>; Sen Roblan
<Sen.ArnieRoblan@oregonlegislature.gov>

Cc: Jeff Stone <jstone@oan.org>

Subject: OAN testimony - SB 928 & SB 929

Dear Chair Dembrow and Members of the Committee,

Please find attached written testimony in opposition to SB 928 and SB 929 from Jeff Stone, Executive Director of the Oregon Association of Nurseries, in reference to today's hearings on the bills. Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,
Miles

Miles Pengilly
Legislative Associate
Thorn Run Partners
mpengilly@thornrun.com
(503) 816-9129

Portland Office:
610 SW Alder
Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97205
www.thornrun.com