

Talking Point Outline

Key Talking Points:

- 1) **Farmers care deeply about safety.**
- 2) **California has the strictest and most comprehensive application regulations in the nation and we follow them to the letter.**
- 3) **Today's regulations are working.**
- 4) **Regulations should be based on sound scientific evidence, not unfounded fears.**
- 5) **There is no evidence to demonstrate a change is needed.**

Expanded Talking Points

1. **Farmers care deeply about safety.**

- Introductions. Who you are, what you do, etc.
 - What you grow?
 - How many employees you have
 - Seasonal
 - Year Round
- No one is more concerned about safe fumigant and pesticide applications than growers.
- Our families, our children live on the land we farm. Our friends and extended families live in the surrounding communities.
- If we thought fumigation was unsafe, we wouldn't do it.
- We follow all application regulations to the letter.

2. **California has the strictest and most comprehensive application regulations in the nation and we follow them to the letter.**

- California has the strictest and most comprehensive application regulations in the nation and we follow them to the letter.
- I want to talk a bit about how careful we are with applications around school property and the steps we take.
 - Describe your operations if you farm near a school. Describe the process you go through to ensure that you are protecting the students and faculty and don't apply when school is in session or there are events at the school. Discuss the

permitting process in detail, including how you notify the school, any extra precautions you take, any additional restrictions you take.

3. Today's regulations are working.

- Over the years as California's population has increased, many schools have been built—and continue to be built—on already-existing prime agricultural land next to farm operations.
 - If you know of a local example, talk about it here.
- Placing schools so close to farms places the burden on growers to provide buffers to prevent the dust, noise and smells that are an inherent part of producing food, fiber, fuel and flowers.
- I can understand that people may have questions about applications near schools.
- But there is no evidence to demonstrate cause for concern.
- (If you know of any examples) In fact, the opposite is true:
 - Insert a local example or a personal example you may know of working collaboratively with a school.

4. Regulations should be based on sound scientific evidence, not unfounded fears.

- I haven't seen or heard any legitimate scientific evidence to make me believe that current regulations aren't working or that the public's health is at risk. None.
- In fact, in the briefing paper DPR issued on May 22, in which DPR tallied the results of the 1,779 pesticide inquiries received about schools from September 2011 - September 2014.
- Each of those 1,779 incidents was investigated. The result was that "None of the investigations discovered an exposure or incident or illness."

5 There is no evidence to demonstrate a change is needed.

- DPR's mission is to take into account the importance of farm products and develop regulations that allow their use while also protecting people's health and the environment
- Our state already has the strictest pesticide-application laws in the nation—laws that are clearly more restrictive and protective of the environment than where food would be produced in other parts of the world, if it can no longer be grown in California.

- Californians cannot say they want their food produced locally and then turn around and insist on draconian notification and application restrictions that hamstring efficient and cost-effective food production.
- All regulations should be based on sound scientific evidence.
- I know there are anti-science advocates who want to severely restrict and even ban modern farm products.
- The science just isn't there to support such action or to support additional restrictions.

How to Address Hypothetical Questions

It's possible that farmers at the workshops may get a direct question or two from a DPR official about hypothetical changes to regulations that DPR is considering.

You should not address hypothetical questions. The appropriate time to comment on possible changes is if DPR issues specific recommendations or changes. At that point everyone will provide thoughtful, written comment.

Questions such as those listed below can be addressed by going back to our key talking points that science should guide any changes in regulations and so far, science and data doesn't support more restrictions re: school applications:

- *Should DPR set a buffer zone around schools?*
- *What buffer zone would you think is appropriate?*
- *What notification requirements do you think would be appropriate for school notifications?*
- *Should DPR restrict the time applications should occur?*

A response to any of those questions could be:

I can't address a hypothetical change to policy that I don't think is necessary. I'd like to reiterate again that from my perspective as a farmer, today's regulations are working. I would not support a change to make applications laws any more restrictive since the data doesn't show that a change is warranted.