HOUSE BILL REPORT HB 1127

As Reported By House Committee On:

Agriculture & Ecology

Title: An act relating to integrated pest management.

Brief Description: Requiring integrated pest management.

Sponsors: Representatives Schoesler, Linville, Chandler, Grant, Mastin, Parlette, Buck, Sheahan, Thompson and Anderson.

Brief History:

Committee Activity:

Agriculture & Ecology: 1/29/97, 1/30/97 [DPS].

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE & ECOLOGY

Majority Report: The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 11 members: Representatives Chandler, Chairman; Parlette, Vice Chairman; Schoesler, Vice Chairman; Linville, Ranking Minority Member; Anderson, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Cooper; Delvin; Koster; Mastin; Regala and Sump.

Staff: Kenneth Hirst (786-7105).

Background: The Center for Sustaining Agriculture and Natural Resources was created by statute at Washington State University. State law directs that among the center's primary activities are research programs which focus on developing possible alternative production and marketing systems through integrated pest management.

Summary of Substitute Bill: Within a year, each of the following must implement integrated pest management practices when carrying out their duties related to pest control: the departments of Agriculture, Ecology, Fish and Wildlife, Transportation, Natural Resources, Corrections, and General Administration; the Parks and Recreation Commission; the State Noxious Weed Control Board; and each state institution of higher education (for the institution's own building and grounds maintenance). Each must provide integrated pest management training for employees responsible for pest management and designate an integrated pest management coordinator.

An Interagency Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (IIPMC) is created. The committee is composed of the integrated pest management coordinators of the agencies and institutions, a representative of the Department of Labor and Industries, and a representative of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The coordinator from the Department of Agriculture serves as the chair of the committee.

The IIPMC must advise the state agencies and institutions, and facilitate interagency coordination for each agency's or institution's integrated pest management program. It must meet four times a year, following public notice. All meetings of the committee must be open to the public.

The Department of Agriculture, in consultation with the IIPMC, must submit reports to the Legislature biennially regarding the integrated pest management programs.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill: The list of the duties of individual agency coordinators assigned by the original bill is deleted from the substitute bill. The substitute bill adds representatives of the Department of Labor and Industries and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the coordinating committee, clarifies the objectives sought by integrated pest management, and postpones by one month the deadline by which the biennial report must be prepared.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Effective Date of Substitute Bill: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Testimony For: (1) The bill is based on an Oregon law passed in 1991. The program it sets out has been successful in that state. The greatest value of Oregon's program is the information that is shared among agencies on the coordinating committee. It helps the agencies reduce pesticide use. (2) A good integrated pest management (IPM) program helps agencies get the biggest bang for their pest control bucks. A coordinated approach provides a good knowledge of the pests to be controlled, the control techniques to be used, and a measurement of the efficacy and effects of the control. (3) IPM is the way to get the best long-term control of pests in rights-of-way. (4) The bill represents a good start: it is not an end, but a beginning. The benefits of having a state IPM program may spill over into local governments and the private sector. (5) The advantages to the program are open public meetings on control programs and reports that allow persons to track the use of pesticides by agencies and their trends and costs. (6) The bill represents approaches that are already being used. For example, the gypsy moth control program of the Department of Agriculture.

Testimony Against: (1) The departments of Labor and Industries and Health should be added to the list of agencies on the committee in the original bill. (2) A definition of IPM should emphasize the use of the least toxic pesticides and then only as a last resort. Material safety data sheets identify that most of the constituents of a pesticide— are inert ingredients that are not specified. They provide only limited information about human health risks. (3) The original bill contains too much process. It should be simplified.

Testified: Ray Shindler, Washington Friends of Farms and Forests and Washington Association of Wheat Growers; Robert Berger, Department of Transportation; Mary Beth Lang, Department of Agriculture (representing natural resource agencies); Ted Alby, Washington Friends of Farms and Forests; John Perkins and Sheila Sandwick (all in favor); and Karen McDonell, (commented on the bill).