

Raszka Shelley

From: Gallagher Chuck
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Raszka Shelley
Subject: FW: 7 pesticide bills up on Thursday 3/26

From: Lucy [<mailto:babbles@nehalem.tel.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 11:38 AM
To: chuck.gallagher@state.or.us; Rep.BradWitt@state.or.us; Rep Clem
Cc: larkin@beyondtoxics.org
Subject: 7 pesticide bills up on Thursday 3/26

To all esteemed addressees,

I urge you to support bills HB2589, HB3123, and HB3482. In regard to aerial spraying of pesticides in our forests, these are good bills that support the safety of Oregon citizens.

I urge you to NOT support bills HB4328, HB4329, HB3430, and HB3434. HB3428 provides nothing new, only reinforces current legislation. HB3429—if a pesticide applicator license is required to investigate pesticide poisoning, that would negate a physician, for example, being able to treat or report or testify about pesticide poisoning—how ridiculous is that? Why would an investigator of poisoning need a pesticide **applicator's** license? HB3430 requires State Dept. of Ag to establish telephone line for pesticide calls—no requirement for response, which is what is needed—this bill is neutral. HB3434 would spend more money to do nothing new.

These four described above are BAD bills which do nothing to protect citizens.

I have long been concerned about the forest practices of aerial spraying in Oregon. I have often wondered, “How is it that our elected legislators, including you, think it’s okay to spray pesticides near to drinking water sources (including the headwaters of those streams and creeks that are drinking water sources), to spray pesticides near schools (where our precious children & grandchildren are present) and to spray pesticides near residences (these are the people who voted for you, and expect you to watch out for their welfare).

How is it that citizens have to pay for advance notice of aerial spraying? Why is there not public advance notification of spraying? Doesn’t it make sense that vulnerable citizens (the elderly with respiratory conditions, for example) should have the opportunity to go elsewhere for part or all of a day when there will be aerial spraying in the vicinity?

How is it that the process to report negative effects of aerial spraying is onerous, even obstructive, and not responsive to the concerned citizen who is calling, wanting answers to questions about their health?

How is it that the companies who are contracted to do the aerial spraying are not 100% accountable for spraying in adverse conditions and allowing unacceptable drift?

The following three bills HB2589, HB3123, and HB3482 are GOOD bills. HB2589 requires State Dept. of Ag to prohibit application of pesticide products containing nitro-group neonicotinoids—this is GOOD. HB3123 prohibits application of pesticide by aircraft with minor exceptions—this is GOOD. HB3482 requires state or local agency/government to KEEP RECORDS of pesticide applications—oh duh—this is GOOD.

Esteemed Sirs, these 3 bills embody common sense. I hope you evoke your common sense: that you advocate in the Oregon Legislature for their passage.

Let's make Oregon the TOP state in the Pacific Northwest for protecting drinking water, private property, and fish streams.

Respectfully yours,

Lucile W. Brook
Nehalem, Oregon resident