

Comparison of Statutory Requirements and the State IPM Coordinating Committee's 2018 Report

Statutory Requirement HB 3364	Statutory Language	Compliance: Did the OSU and State Agencies follow THE LAW?
634.657 Section 1(c)	A representative of the Oregon University System, appointed by the State Board of Higher Education;	No The State Board of Higher Education did not appoint, or the representative did not attend meetings of the STATE IPM Coordinating Committee
Section 4	The committee shall meet three times per year at the call of the chair for the purposes of:	No The IPMCC met a total of three times in the 5 years since the passage of HB 3364 (2013 until 2018).
Section 4 (c)	Developing an adaptive management approach to the improvement of integrated pest management by state agencies and public universities;	No There is no documentation that IPMCC developed an overall “adaptive management approach to the improvement of IPM”
Section 4 (e)	Reporting on, and developing a set of performance metrics to adequately describe, state agency and public university progress in implementing integrated pest management;	No Neither the IPMCC nor any agency reported a set of performance metrics that used to implement State IPM (with possible exception of ODOT using an 18-year old benchmark from 2010)
Section 4 (h)	Evaluating the need for notification of pesticide use and the policies for notification as part of state agency and public university integrated pest management programs.	No The IPMCC Report had no discussions or mention of pesticide notification policies for agencies or public universities.
Section 7	The committee shall prepare a biennial report to an interim committee of the Legislative Assembly relating to pest management matters.	No The first report was put together in 2018, and then only after an inquiry and public records request was filed by Beyond Toxics.
Section 7 (e)	Performance metric results for the implementation of integrated pest management, including but not limited to state agency and public university progress toward the goal of protecting the economy, ecosystems and water quality of this state and protecting the health and welfare of children, the elderly and other members of the public.	No This section is central to the purpose of HB3364, but there is an absence of discussion on protecting human health, the welfare of children, elderly and members of the public; No mention of protecting ecosystems and water quality. There are no performance metrics, progress reports
Section 1 (b)	Coordinates the use of pest biology, environmental information and comprehensive technology to prevent unacceptable levels of pest damage by economical means and poses the least possible risk to people, property, resources and the environment.	Partial Compliance The report did not include any examples of how state agencies chose methods that pose the least possible risk to people, property, resources and the environment.
Section 1 (c) I	Control practices selected and applied to achieve desired pest management objectives in a manner that minimizes risks to human health, nontarget organisms, native fish and wildlife habitat, watersheds and the environment.	No The report is vague or fails to address risks to human health, nontarget organisms, native fish and wildlife habitat, watersheds and the environment.