









Oppose HB 4109 and Support the -5 Amendment

Oregon's farm families are struggling. <u>Farm income is half of what it was six years ago</u>, and margins are increasingly slim.^{1,2} Clean fuels requirements add hundreds of dollars to a farm's bottom line, and employment mandates make it difficult to afford a workforce. Oregon's commercial activities tax adds an additional burden to families who are barely netting an income. And now, the Oregon House is voting to eliminate a critical crop management tool for Oregon farmers, and <u>without financial support</u> or a review of alternatives. The impact of HB 4109 could devastate families who are already struggling.

Vote 'NO' on HB 4109

- HB 4109 includes <u>NO funding</u> to support Oregon agriculture. Research to find alternative pesticides can take <u>over five years</u> and <u>hundreds of thousands of dollars per crop and pest</u>.
 - > CA allocated an initial \$5.7 million to help crop scientists and farmers find alternatives, but not HB 4109.
- HB 4109 bans a critical tool for many of Oregon's specialty crops. Some specialty crops have few or no alternatives to combat pests and will suffer lost crop yields and reduce farm income. In California, an economic analysis determined that banning chlorpyrifos would lead to an estimated 300% increase in production costs for certain crops.³
 - WA's bill protects specialty crop growers from financial devastation, but not HB 4109.
- HB 4109 <u>jeopardizes agricultural exports</u>. Other states and countries have strict phytosanitary requirements, meaning they don't allow any pest presence in a shipment. Chlorpyrifos is necessary for some farmers to meet pest tolerance standards in the international market.
 - WA's bill keeps doors open to trade, but not HB 4109.

Vote 'YES' on the -5 Amendment

- It reaches the same safety measures as HB 4109 to protect farm workers and bystanders from the risk of exposure to chlorpyrifos.
- It maintains chlorpyrifos for emergency pest outbreaks and for farmers who need it to meet export requirements.
- It allows at ODA to continue rulemaking—with agencies and stakeholders at the table—to identify additional risk mitigation measures needed to protect public health.

We support the responsible and safe use of pesticides to protect the health and safety of our workforce and our families. That's why we are serious about following the federal **Worker Protection Standard**, state-expanded **Application Exclusion Zone**, and chlorpyrifos **label** requirements for **buffers**, **personal protective equipment**, and **restricted entry interval**. That's also why we're working with farmworker representatives, state agencies, and toxicologists in a rulemaking to identify additional measures to protect public health. HB 4109 circumvents this regulatory process without scientific justification and jeopardizes the viability of family farmers in Oregon.

Please OPPOSE HB 4109 and SUPPORT the -5 amendment to protect workers and maintain the viability of family farms

¹ Randy Schnepf. (2017). U.S. Farm Income Outlook for 2017. Congressional Research Service.

² Keith Good. (2019). *Net Farm Income Down Almost 50% – Ag. Sec. Perdue Tells House Ag*. Ag-Fax. https://agfax.com/2019/02/28/net-farm-income-down-almost-50-ag-sec-perdue-tells-house-ag/

³ Rachael Goodhue, K. M.-C. (2019). *Economic and pest management evaluation of the withdrawal of chlorpyrifos: six major California commodities.*Prepared for the Department of Pesticide Regulation by the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Office of Pesticide Consultation and Analysis and the University of California.