

July 26, 2006

The Honorable Daniel E. Lungren  
House of Representatives  
2448 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

RE: Agribusiness Security Working Group

Dear Congressman Lungren,

We strongly encourage you to attend the House Homeland Security Committee's markup of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 (H.R. 5695) on Thursday morning. The agriculture industry has worked closely with members of the House and Senate over the past several years to ensure that any legislation adopted by the Congress is truly security based and takes into account compliance with existing regulations and voluntary industry efforts.

We are particularly concerned about two amendments that we believe will be offered during Thursday's full committee markup. We urge you to oppose the following proposals:

**Please oppose Congressman James Langevin's effort which would likely create a patchwork of differing state chemical site security laws.** We believe it is necessary to establish a single set of national standards to avoid a confusing, costly, and inconsistent patchwork of security regulations. Congress is prepared to vest the Department of Homeland Security with the authority to provide national regulations; the impact of these efforts will be diluted if the Langevin amendment is adopted. The federal government should assert its constitutional authority to provide for the common defense and establish uniform national standards for chemical security. We urge you to reject the Langevin amendment.

**Please oppose Congressman Edward Markey's effort to include environmental provisions to a security bill.** "Inherently safer technology" is a process change, frequently referred to as the relocation, substitution, modification of processing, or the reduction of a substance of concern. Such decisions should be left to facilities' process safety experts. In fact, industry often considers such process changes during day-to-day operations. However, the inclusion of such language in a security bill broadens the legislation beyond its original intent and includes environmental and worker safety policies that are simply not germane to the issue of securing chemical facilities from terrorist attacks. The costs associated with so-called "IST's" are significant and would ultimately have real economic impacts on food and fiber production in the U.S.

The agriculture industry is committed to increasing the security of all Americans, and we urge you to consider our position on these important issues.

Sincerely,

National Agricultural Aviation Association  
Chemical Producers and Distributors Association  
American Farm Bureau Federation  
CropLife America  
The Fertilizer Institute  
Agricultural Retailers Association