



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 20, 2020

Timothy G. Sekerak
Chief Clerk of the House
Oregon House of Representatives
State Capitol Building
Salem, OR 97301

RE: Vote Explanation House Bill 4109

Dear Chief Clerk Sekerak,

Please accept this explanation of my vote on House Bill 4109. I represent the Kalapuya District, which contains a larger number of agricultural communities and segments of the Santiam, Calapooya, McKenzie, and Willamette Rivers, as well as a number of other smaller streams. Both agriculture and safe drinking water are important to me and I have constituents on both sides of this issue.

What do we know about this pesticide? In the words of the testimony from its hearing in the House Health Care Committee, "Chlorpyrifos is a toxic nerve agent pesticide that can impact neural development in children, babies, and fetuses. These neurodevelopmental impacts have lifelong implications for the affected individuals and for the state of Oregon (Grandjean 2014). Affected individuals suffer from both decreased average lifetime earnings capacity and economic productivity."

"A multi-center study of 40 babies exposed to chlorpyrifos prenatally showed structural changes on MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) of the brains associated with higher prenatal exposure. The higher exposure was also associated with lower IQ (intelligent quotient) measures," wrote Dr. Lauren Herbert, a pediatrician from my district.

Agricultural communities are exposed to chlorpyrifos in their homes. This can occur from drift as well as by pesticides hitching home on family members exposed at work.

Further, chlorpyrifos can persist in the environment, where it is very toxic to many bird species, fish, aquatic invertebrates, and key pollinators such as bees. The staff recommendation of the US EPA was to ban chlorpyrifos due to its danger to public health and the environment. There is no safe level of chlorpyrifos in the environment. Despite this, political leadership at EPA overrode the scientific recommendation and refused to ban it, leaving it to us to act. Why not just wait for ODA to act? They've already said that they lack the staff and expertise to perform this function. That leaves it to us.

Opposed to the legislation, I have some farmers telling me that they don't believe the science, that we should take more time, and that it might cost them money if they'd have to buy an alternative. This testimony appeared to ignore both the impact of even small doses of this toxic compound and the reality that, while a given farm may only apply it once per year, farm workers and their families could be exposed several times a year as they move from farm to farm.



MARTY WILDE
STATE REPRESENTATIVE
DISTRICT 11



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I believe the science. I don't believe that we should get an economic advantage by putting our children and environment at risk. The parties in the debate all agreed that this chemical was so very effective exactly *because* it is so toxic to anything with a nervous system. I'm more than happy to work to help any businesses transition to less harmful products as we approach the deadline. I'm happy to help forge a better process to regulate pesticides at the state level. But I'm not willing to put more kids at risk when the evidence is clear. I am proud to vote yes in support of this vital legislation.

Sincerely,

Representative Marty Wilde

