

Journal of Environmental and Sustainability Law

Missouri Environmental Law and Policy Review
Volume 10
Issue 1 2002-2003

Article 8

2002

Legislative Update

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/jesl>



Part of the [Environmental Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Legislative Update, 10 Mo. Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 59 (2002)

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/jesl/vol10/iss1/8>

This Legislation is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Environmental and Sustainability Law by an authorized editor of University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact bassettcw@missouri.edu.

positive step forward for sustainable development interests. The Summit's organizers made a serious effort to improve the transparency of the Summit negotiations by opening conference doors to the public and by seeking the inclusion of non-governmental interests through the participation of civil partnerships. Although the efforts have been criticized since most of the deal making still goes on behind closed doors, many believe that the lobbying efforts and financial resources of civil society may be the best hope for achieving what politicized national governments cannot.

This success was evidenced by WaterAid, a non-governmental organization that lobbied successfully for the most concrete target of the Summit – halving the number of people without proper water and sanitation by 2015. Two-hundred twenty partnerships attended the Summit, bringing with them \$235 million, and an additional 60 partnerships formed at the Summit.

Though the Johannesburg Summit was certainly a disappointment to environmentalists, the particularized failures of the Summit may not be sufficient to condemn the Summit as a whole. The Summit made concrete commitments to improving human health and agriculture. The United Nations made attempts to improve the transparency of summit process and, despite imperfections, broke ground in the inclusion of civil partnerships in the negotiations. Finally, the Summit placed the issues of sustainable development before the world and produced a vision clarifying how to achieve it. As Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, said, we must look at the Johannesburg Summit not as the end, but rather the beginning to a future of worldwide commitment to sustainable development.

THOMAS L. SCHMID

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

SB 1165 – Creates the “Pesticide Project Fund” Sponsored by Senators Mathewson, Childers, and Johnson

SB 1165 was introduced and read for the first time on February 14, 2002 in the Missouri Senate. A second reading and subsequent referral to the Senate Agriculture, Conservation, Parks and Tourism Committee occurred on February 27, 2002.

The bill was designed to repeal Missouri Revised Statutes Sections 281.240 and 281.260 while enacting three new sections relating to pesticide. SB 1165 was intended to create a “Pesticide Project Fund” in which annual pesticide registration fees were deposited.

The statute designated certain amounts of the fund be used toward specific purposes. First, up to twenty percent of the fund was to be used for administration of the “Pesticide Project Fund” and the pesticide registration program. Second, up to eighty percent was intended for pesticide education efforts, training, monitoring, pesticide container disposal initiatives, pest management practices, and other related issues. The remaining money could be used to fund pesticide related issues at the discretion of the director.

The Plant Industries Division of the Department of Agriculture was chosen to administer the “Pesticide Project Fund.” The bill also required the director to establish an advisory committee to evaluate projects and make recommendations upon disbursement of funds. SB 1165 set up procedures for the application process and distribution of funding while allowing the fund to have a maximum balance of five million dollars.

Along with creating the “Pesticide Project Fund”, SB 1165 stipulated that changes in a company's name, trade name, active ingredient, concentration of active ingredient, or EPA

registration numbers would not be considered minor. Thus, such changes would require registration as a new product.

Also, SB 1165 increased the annual registration fee from fifteen to one hundred twenty-five dollars, which was to become effective in 2003. The original fifteen-dollar fee would go to the general revenue fund while the remainder would be placed into the "Pesticide Project Fund."

Finally, the bill allowed the director, after a hearing, to suspend, deny, or cancel a pesticide registration if the pesticide could cause damage, injury, or harm to the environment. Such a decision would be made after considering research findings and other government recommendations.

On February 28, 2002 the Senate Agriculture, Conservation, Parks and Tourism Committee held a hearing on the bill, but SB 1165 was not passed during the 2002 Missouri legislative session.

SUSAN B. HENDERSON