



March 8, 2023

Submitted by email to Amanda.Rudolph@house.mn.gov

Honorable Samantha Vang, Chair
Honorable Kristi Pursell, Vice Chair
Committee on Agriculture Finance and Policy
Capitol, Room 120
100 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, MN 55155

Re: HF 1150, Registration for pesticides containing perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance prohibited

Dear Chair Vang, Vice Chair Pursell, and distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture Finance and Policy,

On behalf of RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment)[®] and CropLife America, we respectfully oppose HF 1150 because the current regulatory framework within the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is appropriate for regulating all aspects of pesticide sales and use within the state, including the sale and use of fluorinated pesticides. The pesticide ban proposed in HF 1150, based upon a registered pesticide product's chemical composition, is unnecessary and inappropriate.

Pesticides registered by MDA under Chapter 18b, including those containing fluorinated chemistry, are essential to protecting public health and safety, communities, ecosystems, and crops grown in Minnesota. Pesticides are applied in Minnesota by professional applicators, growers, and consumers to manage mosquito and tick populations, create fire breaks, maintain roadway lines of site, keep transportation and utility rights of way clear of vegetation, manage invasive and non-native species on land and in water, and to grow important food crops.

Pesticides are rigorously regulated under existing federal law. Pesticides are unique substances, with more scientific data available about them than for any other products available in commerce today. Pesticide products are subject to regulation and oversight from five federal agencies: EPA, Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Administration, Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service. This multi-agency federal regulatory framework is focused on ensuring products can be used safely. This framework is also the foundation of the federal and state pesticide regulatory partnership.

To approve a new pesticide under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), EPA must determine that, when used in accordance with the label, it will *not* cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment and *does* provide a reasonable certainty of no harm to human health.¹ EPA must periodically review registered pesticides to ensure they continue to meet this robust safety standard.

¹ 7 U.S.C. §136a(c)(5).

EPA subjects all new pesticide products to rigorous human health and environmental review and testing requirements to satisfy these standards for registration. These testing requirements include, depending on the type of pesticide, the following:

- Product chemistry
- Physical and chemical properties
- Acute, sub-chronic, and chronic toxicity
- Efficacy testing (for public health uses)
- Ecological effects
- Environmental fate
- Applicator exposure
- Residue chemistry (for food use pesticides)

These tests take months and years to complete and represent an investment of millions of dollars by pesticide companies in the science that supports all products available to Minnesota residents, professional applicators, and agricultural producers. EPA expends significant resources to review and approve the testing data during a rigorous process. It can take more than 10 years before a new product is registered for sale due to the rigorous registration process.

The federal and state regulation of pesticide distribution, sale, and use, as well as stringent safety standards and oversight, are well established federally under FIFRA and in Minnesota under Chapter 18b. The statutes are designed to evolve as science advances, to support product innovation, and to provide for robust stakeholder and public input into pesticide regulation. The statutes require the review of the most current scientific data on health and environmental impacts for all pesticide products and impose requirements to minimize any risks before they are made available for sale and use.

All pesticides, including those formulated with fluorinated chemistry, must already be registered by EPA prior to applying for and receiving a state registration from MDA. Before pesticides even enter commerce in Minnesota, they must already be deemed safe by EPA.

Regulators have broad authority to regulate pesticides. EPA and MDA have broad authority to change the availability and use status of any pesticide product at any time for a range of safety and scientific reasons. These regulatory processes and options should not be superseded by the pesticide ban proposed in HF 1150.

Further, there is no exposure data showing whether people are even exposed to PFAS in using registered pesticides in accordance with their directions for use. Under FIFRA's Section 6(a)(2), pesticide registrants are required to report any adverse effects to EPA from the use of a pesticide, and we are not aware of any incident of adverse effects from the use of pesticides due to PFAS in Minnesota or any other state. EPA monitors this information to ensure that pesticides are safe for use.

Recent action by EPA shows the current regulatory framework for pesticides works. The EPA approves and maintains a list of non-food inert ingredients that could be used in pesticide formulations and other types of products. In December 2022 the agency announced it was finalizing the removal of 12

chemicals from the list that had been previously approved as non-food inert ingredients for use in pesticide products. This proposal was open for public comment and resulted in inerts “not currently used in any pesticide products,” being removed from the list with the caveat that new scientific data would have to be presented to the agency to support their future use. This agency action clearly shows the system works.

We find the pesticide ban proposed in HF 1150 to be unnecessary given the science-driven regulatory programs administered and enforced by the Minnesota Department of Agriculture and the United States Environmental Protection Agency and ask the committee for an unfavorable vote.

Please contact us if we can provide further information or answer committee member questions.

Sincerely,



Megan J. Provost
President
RISE
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22203
202-872-3860



Chris Novak
President and CEO
CropLife America
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22203
202-296-1585

RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment)[®] is the national trade association representing manufacturers, formulators, distributors, and other industry leaders engaged with specialty pesticides and fertilizers used by professionals and consumers. Learn more at www.pestfacts.org.

CropLife America (CLA) represents the manufacturers, formulators, and distributors of crop protection products in the United States. CLA member companies produce, sell, and distribute virtually all the crop protection products used by American farmers. Learn more at www.croplifeamerica.org.