

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 8:21 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: null [mailto:takeaction@nrcm.org] On Behalf Of Russell Dupree
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 6:16 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Jul 20, 2010

Board of Pesticides Control
ME

Please ask the Legislature to restore the provisions in the existing free registry that required all users of aircraft or air blaster equipment to notify people living within 1/4 mile of spray areas. The Legislature should not have weakened these provisions.

Sincerely,

Mr. Russell Dupree
1077 US Route 1
Freeport, ME 04032-7102
(207) 865-3282

Schlein, Paul B

From: jody spear [jodyspear@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 7:05 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: further clarification (just went back and read the rest of the June minutes)
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Sorry, Paul, but the point of mentioning Shelia Zahm was to say that she is a National Cancer Institute researcher who serves on the advisory board of Maine Institute of Human Genetics and Health (as you know, having found the press notice of her appointment). Inasmuch as MIHGH's mandate is to examine environments that increase the risk of cancer, and Dr. Zahm has for years been conducting an Agricultural Health Study to identify human health risks from pesticide exposure, she has relevant information to convey to the board on the matter at hand -- the public's right to know when spraying is to occur, and what will be applied -- as well as other matters requiring expert opinions. I learn from Henry Jennings that Dr. Zahm will not be joining the board's medical advisory panel in a formal way, but I urge them to solicit her advice actively.

John Martin represents the Eagle Lake/Allagash region in the legislature (please add that qualifier to the minutes). When I track down the context for his statement about vinegar as an herbicide, I'll forward it.

As for an appropriate radius for notification of cosmetic pesticide applications, I would not have restricted my definition to include only chemical-sensitive** individuals. Advance notice is important for everyone, for a variety of reasons.

Thanks,

Jody

P.S. In a doctor's exam room recently, I saw posted the notice inviting signups for the registry, and I'd like to request that for the next round, you send the information to all hospitals and medical offices in the state. This particular doctor got the notice in her capacity as town health officer, but she thinks it should be displayed prominently where patients go for their appointments. I agree with her assessment, and I hope you do too.

** (Like *light-sensitive*, the first word of the adjectival compound does not end in "ly.")

Subject: UPDATE: July 23, 2010, Board of Pesticides Control Meeting & Public Information Gathering Meeting
Date: Wed, 21 Jul 2010 12:00:46 -0400
From: Paul.B.Schlein@maine.gov
To: Paul.B.Schlein@maine.gov

Additional comments have been added to agenda item 3:
Public Information Gathering Session About Development of a Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry

- *Comments Received Regarding a Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry [PDF]*

The attached file includes all the new comments.

Paul Schlein
Public Information Officer
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
28 State House Station

8/19/2010

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 7:51 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: pesticides
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: william leavenworth [mailto:sapereaude@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 11:01 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticides

Generally speaking, pesticides do more damage to the soil biota than they are worth, except to ignorant and indifferent monoculturists who don't care what happens to the soil in the future. And that is before the pesticide residues wash into the watershed. Except in individual cases, such as Asian Longhorn beetles, pesticides should not be used in Maine.

Dr. W. B. Leavenworth

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 7:50 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: pesticide spray notification
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Vicki J Salsbury [mailto:vicki.salsbury@maine.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 7:59 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticide spray notification

I will not be able to travel the three hours on a work day to attend the meeting in Portland concerning "pesticide spray notification" but I would like to voice my opinion to you in hopes that it will help reinforce the feeling that we have the right to know when pesticides are being sprayed near and around us. I am particularly concerned that drift exposure be strongly addressed. Thank you for hearing me out. Vicki Salsbury, Hancock County.

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 10:07 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Pesticide spray notification!!!
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Sandy [<mailto:happycampers323@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 6:48 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Pesticide spray notification!!!

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I want you to be aware that I want strong and effective pesticide spray notification standards. I believe I have a right to know about any spraying around my land. I also feel strongly about ensuring neighbor notification about all outdoor pesticide applications.

I have allergies to pesticides and need to protect myself. I strongly encourage notification and my right to know within a reasonable time and preventing spraying of all sorts in my area because I am growing organically in my gardens and blueberries patches.

Please help maintain my rights as I feel they are dwindling concerning pesticide free environment and my health.

Thank you for your time,

Sandy Parent
7 MaCavity Drive
Turner, ME 04282

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 10:07 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: pesticide notification
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Steven Campbell [mailto:greenman@surfglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 6:09 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticide notification

This is a very necessary action to take in order to protect people from the poisons in pesticides. It is almost exactly three years since I was poisoned by drift-over pesticides being sprayed on an adjacent piece of land. I am still struggling to regain my health and I may never achieve the vitality and vigor that I had prior to this exposure. The symptoms are throughout every system in my body and have made just living a struggle. I am currently receiving reports of nearby aerial spraying and I am very, very grateful for this information. Just hearing that plane flying by stresses my system and causes the blood pressure to go up. If you ask me this process needs to stop. Poisoning food and the ground and the water cannot be an intelligent solution. Please do what you can to stop this practice altogether. Organic methods work; we just need to re-adjust our mindset and our priorities. At the very least, people deserve the right to know what is being sprayed and where. It is the right thing to do. Thank you

Steven Campbell
255 Egypt road
Presque Isle, ME 04769

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 9:29 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: null [mailto:takeaction@nrcm.org] On Behalf Of Nancy Fording
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 12:18 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Jul 21, 2010

Board of Pesticides Control
ME

Please develop a strong, free, and comprehensive pesticide registry for all citizens in the state. We have the right to know if people are using pesticides near our homes. As a first step, please ask the Legislature to restore the provisions in the existing free registry that required all users of aircraft or air blaster equipment to notify people living within 1/4 mile of spray areas. The Legislature should not have weakened these provisions. Strengthen them now!

I am concerned about the use of pesticides on some of our lawns in Ogunquit. These chemicals are dangerous to our health and well-being, and we need to educate our citizens to begin to use better health products like organic land care products that are safe for our citizens and their lawns. The health of our Maine people is at risk as pesticides are used around lawns. Children need to have safe, non-chemical lawns to play on.

Pesticides are toxic chemicals. All Maine citizens have the right to know when they are used nearby.

Sincerely, Nancy Fording

Sincerely,

Mrs. Nancy Fording
73 Grasshopper Ln
Ogunquit, ME 03907-3226
(207) 646-4349

Schlein, Paul B

From: jody spear [jodyspear@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 4:14 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: correction to your summary of my comments at the Machias meeting last month
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Hi Paul -

What I said about CCD and Dave Hackenberg is that he trucks bees all over the U.S. to pollinate crops, and he will not go where neonicotinoids (e.g., Imidacloprid) are used because they are demonstrably lethal to bees. I said that Wyman, his major customer among blueberry growers, has agreed not to use neonicotinoids as a result. (Hackenberg is quoted in countless stories about CCD, but has not as yet authored a book on the subject.)

I believe I added [if not I am recording the fact here] that despite the clear causal connection between bee deaths and imidacloprid, local blueberry growers (G.M. Allen in my area for one) have now begun using IMD as a "friendly" alternative to phosmet (Imidan).

The threat to our food supply posed by wanton decimation of pollinators cannot be overestimated. I ask that the Board begin a systematic monitoring of bee populations now that this trend toward spraying of neonicotinoids is underway.

Please include this note in the packet for the July meeting if you can.

Thanks --

Jody

I

Subject: UPDATE: July 23, 2010, Board of Pesticides Control Meeting & Public Information Gathering Meeting
Date: Wed, 21 Jul 2010 12:00:46 -0400
From: Paul.B.Schlein@maine.gov
To: Paul.B.Schlein@maine.gov

Additional comments have been added to agenda item 3:
Public Information Gathering Session About Development of a Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry

- *Comments Received Regarding a Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry [PDF]*

The attached file includes all the new comments.

Paul Schlein
Public Information Officer
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
28 State House Station
Augusta ME 04333-0028
207-287-7533 Phone
207-287-7548 Fax
<http://www.thinkfirstspraylast.org>

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 7:50 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: July 23 Meeting on Pesticide Notification
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Bob [<mailto:fritsch@psouth.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 8:32 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: July 23 Meeting on Pesticide Notification

Mr. Jennings,

I believe strongly that pesticides should be used only when ABSOLUTELY necessary and then sparingly. Needless to say I am a firm advocate of notifying anyone living in the area to be sprayed. It is only fair play to let people know so they can vacate the area if they so choose.

Thankyou,

Robert W. Fritsch II
Dexter, ME 04930

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 3:43 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Portland hearing of the BPC tomorrow
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Richard Fochtman [mailto:rfochtman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 2:25 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Portland hearing of the BPC tomorrow

Greetings, Director Jennings-

As I will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow in Portland regarding public notification of pesticide spraying, I ask you to accept my comments for the rest of the members of the BPC.

- As a bee-keeper, I must remind you that bee colonies in this country are having a very difficult time, and it is estimated that without bees, humans would suffer drastic starvation. In China, there are places where the environment is so polluted, that bees, and other pollinators no longer exist, and humans must use feather dusters to hand pollinate fruits and vegetables. Only China has the manpower to handle this catastrophe.
 - It is not just Collapsed Colony Disorder (CCD) (on which scientists are still working to determine the facts) that has caused the problems of colony die-off. There are now no feral bee colonies in Maine.
 - Scientists research on CCD has found that even non-CCD affected bee colonies have over **40 chemicals** within their bodies which greatly affects their health and viability.
 - These chemicals come from many sources, including the chemicals used by the homemaker, while much is spewed out of smokestacks and tailpipes and comes to Maine with the weather.
 - However, the biggest source of chemicals in our local environment, and the most destructive to humans and bees, are those that are applied by man to the earth to "control" nature - an oxymoron if there ever was one.
 - Regardless of the chemical, spraying saturates a given area, and bees are not able to cope with that intensity. (Take a walk in a chicken barn and see how the chemicals in chicken shit affects you.)
 - Many of the sprayed pesticides are indiscriminate and thus deadly to bees as well as the target insects.
 - Sprayed pesticides are not as easily controlled as a housewife's use of ant poison or dusting her roses.
 - Drift with aerial spraying of pesticides is the biggest issue for bee-keepers.
 - We do not spray children's playgrounds and let children play on them while, or shortly after, chemicals are applied.

- In light of humans dependency on their efforts, why treat bees differently than we do our children.
 - While it is not easy to control bees on a moment's notice, it is possible to plug the hives, keeping the bees inside, for a short period of time if one has been notified far enough ahead of time.
 - Hobby bee-keepers would appreciate the notice considering the cost of new hives
 - Commercial bee-keepers would keep their movable colonies out of any area where aerial spraying is to take place.
- Considering that humans are equally affected by these chemicals, the arguments for the public to be notified prior to chemicals being sprayed is imperative. **Applicators do not have an inherent right to poison us.** Thus the public insists that **applicators have the responsibility of notification as part of doing business**, just as paper companies are required to clean up the water they use before turning it back to the rivers.
 - Access to information about pesticides and their nearby use should be a right of all citizens.
 - A week or two notification ahead of time would give bee-keepers, especially commercial ones, the time to arrange for protection of their colonies.
 - Applicators should be required to notify anyone in the registry within a 1/2 mile of the spraying
 - The registry should apply to ALL OUTDOOR applications, including golf courses, forestry, and farm applications, and spraying for mosquitoes, etc.
 - The nature of the chemical should be included in the notification.
 - The time and date of the application should also be noted.
 - There should be a registry for anyone who wants to apply regardless of whether they own the land or just live on it.
 - People should be able to apply to the registry on the internet
 - They should be able to choose how to be notified - either by mail or email
 - One application rather than an annual renewal
 - Registering should be free
 - The registry should post a current list of all applications taking place by zipcode and date

It is my firm belief that good rules in the beginning are always acceptable to business. It takes the uncertainty out of the equation. While none of us have to like the rules, once made, we all learn to adapt. On the other hand, watered-down or vague rules, or rules that favor business over the public are always a cause for problems in the future.

I trust that the members of the board will do their best to put forth fair and balanced rules, keeping in mind the fragility of lifeforms being affected by these chemicals. Consequently, I would appreciate being notified of your decisions, before you submit them to the Legislature, in order that I may insist that my Legislators get on board with you.

Thank you for listening.

Richard Fochtman,
 553 North Road
 Leeds, Maine 04263
 207-524-2324

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 9:04 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: BPC Hearing Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: amwotton@earthlink.net [mailto:amwotton@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 8:58 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: BPC Hearing Comment

July 22, 2010

Henry Jennings
BPC Director
Board of Pesticides Control
28 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Living in a rural and agricultural-based region, I feel it is important that the pesticide registry should apply to not only agricultural spraying, but to outdoor applications as well. Pesticides drift regardless of the context in which they are being applied. Due to a recent experience with a producer spraying 2-4-D on a grain field on a windy day with several homes nearby, I believe that legislation should be enacted for a strong pesticide notification policy.

The registry should be free and open to anyone living or owning property for any amount of time in Maine and access to information about nearby pesticide spraying should be readily accessible. The farmer in the example above was talked to and asked to stop spraying because of the wind. While he willingly left the field, he mentioned that he would just go someplace else and spray. The point was missed. Meanwhile, drift from 2-4-D was settling on lawns and homes (all with children and pets) within a few hundred feet.

Education is key, for producers, homeowners and those living next to land that is sprayed with pesticides. Please enact laws that protect the health of everyone.

Sincerely,
Angela Wotton
Hammond, ME

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 10:06 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: aerial spraying
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: edie williams [<mailto:therealedie@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 9:33 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: aerial spraying

Please support tight controls on sprayers.

When I lived in Cherryfield, Maine, in the 1990s, I lived adjacent to a Cherryfield Foods' blueberry field. One day as I walked out my front door, they sprayed that field with Orbit? from a helicopter. Needless to say, I was covered with the stuff. When I spoke with the company, not only did they not apologize but said they came to notify me but I was not home. They could have sent a letter! Who knows what effect that spraying will have on my lasting health or the health of my four children.

Support tight controls!

Sincerely,

Dorothy Williams
981 Main Street
Lille, ME 04746

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 12:38 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Pesticide Hearing Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: wormmainea@wormmainea.com [mailto:wormmainea@wormmainea.com] On Behalf Of Mark Follansbee
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 11:51 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Pesticide Hearing Comments

Mr. Jennings:

First I want to recognize the past efforts of the BPC to develop a practical system for notifying the public about potential pesticide drift exposure.

I am writing to be sure the members and staff of the BPC continue to recommend strong and effective pesticide spray notification standards to Maine's Legislature.

In my opinion, the Maine Pesticide Registry should include the following four features:

1. Apply to all outdoor applications, not just agricultural sprays. Pesticides are sprayed in urban, suburban and rural locations. Pesticide drift occurs regardless of the location in which they are being applied.
2. Access to information about nearby pesticide spraying should be free and readily accessible (e.g., website).
3. Citizens on the Registry living within a quarter mile of an intended aerial or air carrier spray area should be notified no less than 24 hours before the application.
4. Citizens on the Registry should remain until the elect to be removed. They should NOT have to re-register each year, and the registry should be FREE and open to anyone living at, working at, or owning property for any amount of time in Maine. Citizens should only have to update when they move within the State.

Maine's citizens must have the right to know about pesticides being sprayed near their homes, farms, and businesses.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mark

Mark Follansbee
33 Arbor View Lane
Scarborough, ME 04074
207-885-9745

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 3:57 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Pesticide Spraying Notification
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Debbie Atwood Town Councilor At Large [<mailto:dratwood@suscom-maine.net>]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 2:45 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Cc: heathers@mofga.org
Subject: Pesticide Spraying Notification

Mr. Jennings, in response to information I received from MOFGA about pesticide spraying notification, I'm writing as an At Large Town Councilor in Brunswick in support of MOFGA's position that Maine needs a strong pesticide spraying notification program. A free, open registry, with no time limit or requirement to re-register, is essential to the health and welfare of everyone at risk of exposure to pesticides.

Due to a scheduling conflict I am unable to attend tomorrow's hearing. Please enter my comments into the record.

Thank you.

Debbie Atwood, Vice Chair
Brunswick Town Council
504-1918

Please be aware that all emails to this address are considered public documents.

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 7:17 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Comprehensive Pesticide Notification registry
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Clark Granger [mailto:clarkgranger@clinic.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 8:15 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Cc: Clark Granger
Subject: Comprehensive Pesticide Notification registry

Dear Henry,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the scope and operation of a single, comprehensive pesticide notification registry. I'd like to address the five bullets your web page uses to solicit comment. Then I'd like to suggest a "blueprint" of how a State Comprehensive Pesticide Registry might work. The perspectives are my own, and do not necessarily reflect the positions of any of the industry groups with which I am involved, nor any of the businesses for whom I consult.

* **The scope and operation of a comprehensive registry.** My belief is that the scope of the registry needs to be inclusive of all powered outdoor pesticide applications, whether conventional or organic, commercial or homeowner, government or private. I think that the objective here is to reduce inadvertent exposure to pesticides, and increase the ability of concerned citizens to take whatever steps they feel are appropriate to protect themselves regardless of the spray source.

* **The types of applications and equipment to be included.** All types of powered outdoor applications and equipment should be included. Drift and volatilization may occur with all types of outdoor pesticide applications, whether the target site is an apple tree beside an urban property line, a conventional or organic crop in a farm field, or a forested tract. Again, if the issue is to reduce inadvertent exposure, concerned citizens should have the opportunity take steps to mitigate their personal assessment of risk. If it is the will of the Board to exclude homeowners from a notification requirement, I would wonder how the Board might justify granting some urban neighbors the right to take advance steps to protect themselves from potential pesticide exposure while denying that right to others. If an important component of notification is to enhance communication between applicators and neighbors, it is difficult to understand why the Board would want to exempt urban neighbors who are also applying pesticides. Folks who are growing their own vegetables in their back yards without pesticides to assure themselves of pesticide free food would certainly want to be notified if their abutters were about to apply pesticides, so they could cover their gardens. If folks were planning a cookout in their back yard, it seems they would appreciate knowing in advance of a neighbor's spray plans. And if the Board were to consider a policy to exclude homeowner applications on the basis that such operations are smaller in scale or use smaller equipment, it should take into account the fact that some homeowners use inexpensive battery operated sprayers capable of producing pressures of 200 psi, mount gasoline engine powered sprayers on ATVs or tow them behind lawn tractors, and use technology that applies up to 20 times more volume of spray per acre than aerial or air carrier equipment. (Examples of such equipment sold for homeowner use will be attached to copies of this email to be distributed at tomorrow's Board meeting in Portland) Given these facts, it is difficult to comprehend a rationale that homeowners should enjoy an exemption from notification requirements. The fact that homeowners may be a difficult target to regulate does not constitute a defensible argument to ignore the hazards homeowners may pose to their abutters.

* **The appropriate distances from a spray site for determining whether neighbors qualify for notification.** I think that distances are too arbitrary a standard. There is no workable science based standard that defines how far pesticides may

8/19/2010

drift from an application site. Much attention has been paid toward trying to define drift distances based on the type of application equipment used, but the fact is that wind direction, intervening vegetation, and operator training and experience are much more important factors affecting spray drift into sensitive areas.

Setting notification distance standards satisfies no one. Any distance standard set may be too generous for applicators, too restrictive for pesticide activists, and so arbitrary as to be meaningless. And from an applicator's standpoint, distance standards are a nightmare to administer.

I think a better approach would be to provide for a basic notification registry which would require an applicator to notify only **property abutters**. Since it is already illegal to spray under conditions which allow drift onto neighboring properties, licensed applicators take great precautions to assure that spray deposits remain on site. Very rarely do they deposit onto an abutting property, much less a property at some greater distance. However, I would favor retention of the Chapter 28 provision which requires any applicator to work with a landowner who requests spray information within 500 feet. Retention of this provision would also give "standing" to folks who for whatever reason miss the opportunity to sign up for a spray registry prior to the spray season. The 500' standard has worked well for years. But it should not be a registry notification standard. It should remain an alternative to the registry, among other things to provide an avenue for citizens who want the privacy of not being listed on a document available to the public at large.

*** The feasibility and advisability of requiring land managers to post signs on properties where pesticides are applied.** I do not believe this a spray registry issue. A spray registry provides the opportunity for property owners to list their properties so applicators may be aware of residents who want to be notified. Signage may be appropriate for folks moving about, who cannot define their presence in a particular locale at the time of pesticide application, but is not appropriate for a registry.

I think signage may be useful for instances of pesticide applications on publicly owned lands and public rights of way, but has no place on private property. The public has an expectation that public areas and public rights of way are maintained for public use and they may safely enter those properties. If pesticides are used in such areas, signage may be appropriate because a notification registry would not work for transients. However, abutters to public properties should be notified if they are on the comprehensive notification registry. Private landowners in Maine are not liable for injuries incurred by the public when they enter private land for recreational purposes. I believe this exemption in Maine law applies also to "harvesters", including those who would collect wild fruit for consumption. Recreationists should assume that private property is managed for the benefit of the landowner and not assume an expectation that it is managed to provide safe public access. Maine law specifies that users of private land enter at their own risk, unless a fee is charged. "No Trespassing" signs might be appropriate, and would undoubtedly become more common if the Board were to confer a landowner liability for failing to warn of pesticide use on private property.

*** The feasibility of developing an automated, internet-based system for land managers to use in notifying registry participants.** I think this would be a fine tool which would expand in utility as the availability of high speed rural internet access increases over time. But until satisfactory rural internet access becomes available, some agricultural producers will need effective alternatives.

During the hearings to date, the Board has solicited suggestions of how a single, comprehensive notification registry might work, given the diversity of sites involved. Using the rationale I have presented above, it would work as follows:

Folks wishing to become listed on the Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry: Those wishing to be registered would need to follow the model established by the original registry, listing all abutting properties. This would apply to all registrants, in rural or remote areas as well as in "town", would resolve the problem contracted applicators often have attempting to locate registrants at varying distances and on short notice, and would serve to keep the notification registry truly comprehensive. In rural areas it would simplify contact procedures for farmers, and therefore encourage the use of IPM approaches.

Listings on the Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry would expire on December 1 of each year and the BPC staff would send renewal notices in January. There would be an opportunity for registrants make changes on the renewal form and an updated list should be made available to applicators by March 1st. Such a process does not strike me as unusually arduous. All state agencies are required to update their subscription mailing lists annually. Essentially all commodity groups update their membership lists annually.

Conventional and organic producers: All organic and conventional producers who apply pesticides outdoors using powered equipment would have to consult the registry to see if abutters are registered, and work with them. They would also have to work with any property owner within 500 feet who makes a request whether they are on the registry or not. (Though not a registry issue, I would suggest that the Board seek legislation to require all producers who apply pesticides to food crops for sale be

licensed, to assist with enforcement activities and to recognize that pesticide residues on food, like drift, constitute an exposure potential.)

Enforcement by BPC would be through inspection of licensed applicators, and through investigation of complaints.

Homeowners: All homeowners (or renters) who use pesticides outdoors using powered equipment would have to consult the registry to see if abutters are registered, and work with them. I think there is a tendency to consider excluding homeowners from the notification process because they generally operate on a smaller scale, and do not use restricted use products. But the fact remains that homeowners are generally not trained in pesticide use and do present the potential to cause concerns to abutters. Homeowners would not have to be licensed. Vendors that sell pesticides to homeowners would be required to post signs advising them to check the registry to see if any of their abutters are registered.

Enforcement by BPC would be through inspection of pesticide vendors, and through investigation of complaints.

Spray contractors: Contractors would be responsible for assuring that abutters on the registry are notified, but only registered abutters. There would be no distance notification requirement.

Enforcement by BPC would be through inspection of licensed applicators, and through investigation of complaints.

Government agencies spraying on public land: All pesticide applications would require notification of abutters on the notification registry and posting of signs at public property entrances prior to spraying and throughout the labeled re-entry period.

Enforcement by BPC would be through investigation of complaints.

Government agencies spraying in rights-of-way: All applications would require notification of abutters on the notification registry and posting of signs. For truck mounted sprayers, signs would be mobile, not stationary, affixed to lead and trailing vehicles, such as used in paint striping activity.

Enforcement by BPC would be through investigation of complaints.

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 7:19 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Letter to Maine Board of Pesticides Control
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: John Kosinski [mailto:johnkosinski@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 11:44 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Letter to Maine Board of Pesticides Control

Maine Board of Pesticides Control
28 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04033

Dear Maine Board of Pesticides Control:

I am a concerned homeowner and parent. I moved to Maine just under a year ago. Among my chief reasons for moving here were the pristine environment, and the clean air and water of this beautiful state. With a young son and another child on the way, living in an unpolluted environment is an even greater concern for me and my wife.

I ask you today to please develop the strongest, most comprehensive rules to protect my family and all of the people of this state from dangerous, toxic chemicals. Please develop rules that require sprayers to notify residents within a ¼ mile radius if they are spraying toxic pesticides. And the rules should apply to all significant sprayers, including those spraying pesticides at golf courses and major corporate lawns. Anything less than a stringent reporting requirement will mean that some Mainers may be unknowingly exposed to dangerous toxic chemicals.

I do not believe individual citizens should need to sign up to be notified when toxic pesticides are sprayed in their community. Instead, I believe the obligation for notification should rest with the sprayer. Requiring individuals to sign up may mean that certain low income families and those without Internet access and many others may not even be aware that there is such a registry. No one should be exposed to toxic chemicals without their knowledge and it should be incumbent upon the sprayers to notify nearby residents whenever and wherever they spray. If residents are aware that a golf course or corporate lawn is being sprayed, they may make choices that affect their exposure to the chemicals, such as keeping their windows closed, or maybe driving a different route to work. But without knowledge of the spraying, individual citizens have no ability to even consider such options.

As I am sure this Board is aware, recent research has demonstrated a distressing relationship between the use of pesticides and certain types of Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) in young children. While such research may not be completely embraced by the scientific community just yet, it is reason enough for policymakers to have the utmost concern and to create rules that offer Maine's families the most

8/19/2010

protection. Anything less will expose unknowing individuals to dangerous toxic chemicals.

Sincerely,

John Kosinski
17 Thompson Street
Brunswick, ME 04011

--

John Kosinski
Mobile: 207.406.1008
Email: johnkosinski@gmail.com

From: Dan Boxer [mailto:dan.boxer@fairchildsemi.com]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 9:20 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Comments for Record of Pesticide Application Notification Hearing

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I was unable to attend today's hearing in Portland but am filing these comments to urge the Board to restore the 1/4 mile previous requirement of notice to the public for pesticide applications.

Having spent 40 years in the legal, corporate and agricultural fields and currently as a Professor of Business Ethics, Corporate Citizenship and Sustainability, I have developed some strongly held beliefs which I believe are relevant to your deliberative process on these regulations.

1. Those in the regulated community who claim that providing more information is an undue and costly burden are, in actuality, mainly concerned that the information they provide may antagonize or rouse to action those who would be affected. In other words: "the less they know the better off we are".
2. Sometimes regulators, even with the best of intentions, are inadvertently "captured" by the wishes of the regulated community. This is a phenomenon which has played out so horrifically to the detriment of the economy and the Gulf of Mexico, in the financial crisis and the BP oil spill. Had the regulatory overseers thought first of the public and the long term impacts, neither crisis would have happened.
3. Companies all across the globe are rethinking the way they interact with all of their stakeholders, especially their neighbors, the communities in which they live and the environment. Forward looking organizations are taking pride in a culture of transparency and citizenship. They are throwing back the curtains and sharing information with the public. Cries of undue burden resulting from transparency are last generation's excuse. The "best" organizations, whether large multinational companies or local orchard or tree care firms, are seeking more ways to share information with the public, not less. Your agency will actually do those whom you regulate a service by imposing on them a culture of transparency and openness.
4. The financial crisis and BP (not to mention Goldman Sachs, Massey Mining and a host of other debacles) have changed the way people look at how much trust they can place in their elected officials, appointed regulators and business organizations. In every case, public trust is at a low point. The BPC should strive to demonstrate that it demands maximum disclosure and transparency and truly puts the interests of the public and the long term environment ahead of short term accommodation of the irrational and poorly articulated "economic" concerns of the regulated community.

Thank you very much and please impose the full 1/4 mile notification requirement for all pesticide applications.

Daniel Boxer
10 Mares Hollow Lane
Cape Elizabeth (where I have lived for over 40 years)

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 7:20 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: null [mailto:takeaction@nrcm.org] On Behalf Of John Kosinski
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 6:06 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Jul 23, 2010

Board of Pesticides Control
ME

Please develop a strong, free, and comprehensive pesticide registry for all citizens in the state. We have the right to know if people are using pesticides near our homes. As a first step, please ask the Legislature to restore the provisions in the existing free registry that required all users of aircraft or air blaster equipment to notify people living within 1/4 mile of spray areas. The Legislature should not have weakened these provisions.

In addition, please develop a more comprehensive registry over time that includes other types of pesticide application technology.

Pesticides are toxic chemicals. All Maine citizens have the right to know when they are used nearby.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Kosinski
17 Thompson St
Brunswick, ME 04011-3019

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:33 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: pesticides
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Kaiulani Lee [<mailto:kaiulanilee@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 1:46 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticides

To whom it may concern,

I had wanted to be in Portland this morning for the hearings but couldn't get off from my work. I would like to throw my support behind The Board of Pesticides notification program. As a child growing up in the Phippsburg area we were airily sprayed for months out of the year. Of course, we didn't know it was dangerous and we, like innocent children all over the country, followed the low flying planes with our arms outstretched as they circled above. We were covered with spray week after week, but we would just jump in the river and wait for the planes to return. It was as exciting as getting a big truck to blow it's horn. We've come a long way thanks to some very brave and wise people, such as Rachel Carson. There is much left, however, for us to be mindful of. The larger truth that Carson revisited, known by generations before us, was the interconnectedness of all life. We are still not grasping this in our contemporary, insular culture. With this most basic of truths we should proceed with any and all applications of pesticides with great caution. That being said, it would seem to me a dangerous arrogance to apply pesticides without notification to all people who might be affected. And here we can only speak to the human, not the animals, livestock and wild, not the plants, soil or water.

I strongly urge the government to enforce all to register for any outdoor application. As we know full well pesticides drift and travel whether they are applied for agriculture or in urban, suburban or rural settings. The book-end to this registration for application is a registry for notification which must be free and available to all who live or own property in the state.

These laws are very basic and long over due. "The obligation to endure gives us the right to know."

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Kaiulani Lee
P.O. Box 194
Phippsburg,
Maine
04562

The New Busy is not the too busy. Combine all your e-mail accounts with Hotmail. [Get busy.](#)

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 7:53 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Notification of pesticide and herbicide applications
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Mary Ellen Marucci [<mailto:mary.marucci@maine.edu>]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 8:25 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Notification of pesticide and herbicide applications

July 23, 2010

RE: Notification of pesticide applications

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I cannot make the hearing on: July 24th. I wish I had known of it when it was held in Presque Isle. I have come upon your email from a link which did not supply me with the proposal. Please send it to me via email. Below are my jottings of what would be nice for it to include. It already might include some.

I support the effort to provide a public database, and notification system for pesticide and herbicide applications through sprays.

We need to know the What, When, Where, Why and How Much along with the accompanying weather and topology. This can be pulled together in a database accessible to all, with notifications automatic to those who opt in to local, regional or continent wide lists.

I take this opportunity to express the need for a comprehensive database and notification system. To do less would give the government a "feel good" and the people false assumptions of safety. It should include ALL applications, including lawn and schools.

A monetary penalty shared by both the applicator and the producer should be included if notification is not given in a timely manner. Anyone affected from dispersal through air, water (surface, ground or precipitation) on their person or property should be acknowledged in the database. There should be an easy way to report drift and water contamination, and a state lab with random split samples analyzed by independent labs to test for all approved agricultural, forestry home and institutional materials that fall under this regulation. Those claiming unintended exposure should have the right to free lab work, including onsite collection.

I manage land in Maine. some of which is to be designated organic permaculture within a forested setting. It is

8/19/2010

imperative that I know of pesticide and herbicide applications within my township and up-wind and up-water adjacent townships, whether or not its from aerial spraying. To be somewhat present looking, notification of GMO plantings and biological agents is also needed as pollen can travel hundreds of miles.

As we all remember too well with 2,4,5 T, some things never break down. if they do, not in the assumed non-detrimental ways. I can only assume that Agent Orange continues to appear in runoff and ground water, in addition to our food and feedstock. I am not sure how Round-Up breaks down except for company claims. It would be nice to know the total application of AO on specific acreage, to determine if it might be suitable for raising of food or feed.

The problem with trying to reduce exposure to known and newer ground-testing chemicals and biologics is to know what to look for and where. If you don't know it can be there then you don't test! A person's sickness is personal and at personal expense, but the profits belong to the company, untouchable under regulation or criminal law as long as they follow regulations or are exempted.

A corporation or government does not suffer physical pain and loss of life that a person does, even though we give these entities rights beyond those of a person. When we use chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and biological agents (including GMO's, fungi, bacteria, insects, and radiation) from companies and governments too big to fail, our first line of defense is not the law or regulation but information. What we know we can do something about. At the least we can try avoidance where possible. At best we can change the way we do business.

What we don't know can hurt us. Without basic exposure information there would be no way to find out why. We do not count as a statistic if we are not the applicator who tries to work upwind, but a downwinder with no way to record exposure! OSHA requires you to stay overnight in a hospital or arrive DOA before tabulating you into a statistic. I am not sure how OSHA handles farm-workers and foresters. They do not include downwinders who are not in the employ of the facility utilizing the agent causing the problem.

I guess that might be one driving force to hire non-citizens who can bring their illness away from the source of contamination, or in the case of non documented workers do not appear in worker exposure statistics. That is one way non-statistics are used to "prove" safety of a compound. The other common way is to dump it downwind and not count the downwinders nor keep records of the dumpings. The FDA claims fixes a non toxic label to what will not cause sickness or death during a short window of time following exposure. Pretty neat science (for the profiteers of this stuff) don't you think. If you are not of the recorded sicknesses among those who work with the chemical there will be no record of adverse effects. Liability is the last thing on my mind but the first on the company's mind (after the bottom line). That is why they will fight against a real database with enough information that can hold them accountable for the side effects of their actions and products. And I will fight for a real database as I know that when the science becomes known only then will we be able to make rational choices. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, especially when there is no guarantee of a cure and attempts at it run much more than a pound.

We need a public database of all applications: What, Where, When, Why, How Much, Weather and Topography. This can be tied in with GIS for the whole world to see. This is the best way to track any forthcoming problems. Liability could be placed to reap back some costs for cleanup and compensation for unexpected health effects to applicators, and end users. Also it would help to prevent dangerous and deleterious situations into the future. To know the past is the first step, but without it not much else can follow. To withhold it is to keep people in ignorance and easily manipulated by company and government claims.

Where culpability can be established profit makings from sales might be used in any attempt at cleanup. If application tonnage and concentration were known about 2,4,5 T, contaminated land would not now continue to produce food and feed crops but instead be delegated to an extraction crop such as trees. Then Maine's cancer rate might not be so high. But of course that is guessing as no one is testing potatoes or any other crop for residuals of herbicide nor what is sprayed for blight, nor are they testing the water. If I am wrong please correct me and direct me to where I can review the sampling and testing of these crops. Where are the records of pesticide and herbicide applications in Maine that give location of application? Data entry is boring, but maybe it can be delegated, or now that we have the technology, entered by each person and company using these chemicals and biologics in a format that will eliminate further handling and provide automatic notification.

Sincerely,

8/19/2010

Mary Ellen Marucci
mary.marucci@maine.edu

physical address:

28 Pleasant St

Fort Kent, Me 04743

Phone: 207-834-6003

cell: 207-538-5770

Prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:30 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Pesticide Notification Considerations (Wish I was able to attend the meeting today)
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: Laurie Wolfrum [<mailto:alohabun@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 12:46 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Cc: Laurie Wolfrum
Subject: Pesticide Notification Considerations (Wish I was able to attend the meeting today)

Hi. My name is Laurie Wolfrum and I live at 26 Good Wind Lane in Camden, Maine. I am writing to you because I was unable to attend the meeting in Portland today to give public comment regarding pesticide notification. (Please know this is SO important to me and I truly wish I could have been there!)

I have four children (ages almost 13, just turned 9, just turned 5 and 18 months) and care about people and the environment.

One morning in 1997 I woke up from a nap with my baby daughter as I smelled something horrible and strong coming in through our open condo windows. I looked out and saw an unmasked person with a large wand and hose wafting green solution all over the lawn. It was connected to a large truck. I shut my windows and made some phone calls to find out what was happening. After speaking with our condo management company, the pesticide company and finding out what the laws were in the state I lived in (NJ), and doing further research, I learned I was able to receive notification before the pesticide company came and was able to stop spraying on my section of the lawn and in the children's park. A couple of other condo owners also requested that their lawn not be sprayed. In any case, I learned that even though I could not stop spraying on all of our property, I felt empowered because I was able to receive notification beforehand and I knew which areas I felt safer for my daughter to play on. In addition, I joined one of the condo committees and was able to negotiate with our condo management company and the lawn care company about which of the harshest chemicals to replace (we got rid of 2, 4-D and others) and to introduce an IPM policy as well as consider organic and alternatives of controls for pests. I didn't feel completely protected as lawns right next to mine were directly sprayed. However, I knew at least when to shut my windows and spend most of my time away from our development. It made the time I spent there better as I could take some actions that helped me feel like I was making a better choice for my family's health.

I think it would behoove MBPC if the regulations would allow interested people to be notified (free of charge) of pesticide applications so that they may take whatever precautions they feel are necessary to protect themselves.

I understand that each person may feel differently about what kind of precautions are necessary. However, because there are many people who would feel it necessary to shut windows, bring in outdoor furniture, cover children's play structures and toys, etc, the most respectful and kind thing to do would be to let them know when pesticide applications take place so they can do what they wish so they feel safer. It is very disempowering to feel like you have no choice when someone is going to apply chemicals and you think it might affect you or your family

8/19/2010

whether by drifting onto your lawn or the air you breathe, drinking in your water, or having it inadvertently applied to your own property if a nearby property is being treated. What can empower people is to at least know about the application and then have the ability and choice to do what they can to feel safer or be able to protect their family.

I believe there should be a consolidated registry for all notifications (urban, suburban and rural) and that even golf courses and corporate lawns should have to comply with the same regulations as areas of agriculture. Whether the application is on a farm, golf course, corporate lawn, neighbor's lawn, or an apple tree farm, a person living near such a location will have the chemicals applied near them and it still matters that we have the choice to take any precautions we feel necessary to protect ourselves. Everyone should have the right to be notified so that they can make sure they are doing whatever feels necessary to protect themselves and their families. Don't take that away from people in the name of business or to make things easier on the chemical companies, applicators or to lesson work in general. Safety should be number one consideration. Help people feel safe and they will feel satisfied with the regulations.

Please revise the regulations so that those living within a quarter of a mile of intended aerial or air carrier spray receive notification.

Please make it easy for people so that they do not need to reregister each year (but ask them to let you know if they no longer wish to receive notification at some point).

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:21 PM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: null [mailto:takeaction@nrcm.org] On Behalf Of Suzanne McLain
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 9:07 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Support a strong, no-cost pesticide registry in Maine

Jul 23, 2010

Board of Pesticides Control
ME

Pesticide control is a public health issue that demands public education. As the body charged with oversight, you are in a unique position to educate and protect the citizens of Maine. As a taxpayer, I implore you to act on our behalf.

I was the director of a large campus and community child care program in NYS for 23 years. The changes that occurred during my tenure re pesticide exposure were significant: when spraying occurred on campus where our children played each day, notification went from 0 to 100% over almost a quarter of a century. Today, notice is given a full one week in advance of any type of spraying on that campus. All parents and staff receive notification through the center, resulting in wide-spread education about this public health issue.

Our family currently lives in a rural area of Maine. The excellent Durham newsletter is invaluable to us and serves as an example of a tool that could be effectively utilized throughout the state to notify and educate citizens about this issue. School system newsletters should also be utilized to inform parents and staff. Research is clear: pesticides are especially toxic to children and pregnant women.

Please develop a strong, free, and comprehensive pesticide registry for all citizens in the state. We have the right to know if people are using pesticides near our homes. As a first step, please ask the Legislature to restore the provisions in the existing free registry that required all users of aircraft or air blaster equipment to notify people living within 1/4 mile of spray areas. The Legislature should not have weakened these provisions.

In addition, please develop a more comprehensive registry over time that includes other types of pesticide application technology.

Pesticides are toxic chemicals. All Maine citizens have the right to

know when they are used nearby.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Suzanne McLain
77 Quaker Meeting House Rd
Durham, ME 04222-5423
(207) 353-8305

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 7:50 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Public Comment in Support of A Comprehensive Pesticides Registry and Notification

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Laura Sholtz [mailto:laurasremedies@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 25, 2010 11:40 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Public Comment in Support of A Comprehensive Pesticides Registry and Notification

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I am writing you to express my opinion about the BPC's public process around pesticides notification rules and registries.

Pesticides are toxic chemicals, which have been linked to several serious diseases, like Parkinson's and Childhood Leukemia.

The public has the right to know about toxic chemicals where they live. I fell that a quarter mile is a reasonable notification distance.

I also believe that the requirement that all aerial pesticide applicators notify the public about spraying, which was authorized in 2009, should be restored immediately. It should not matter whether the sprayer is a farmer or golf club owner.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Laura Sholtz
384 Fogler Road
Exeter, ME 04435

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 7:51 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: Pesticide Spraying Notification Laws

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Lunden [mailto:jleelunden@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 25, 2010 6:59 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Cc: heathers@mofga.org
Subject: Pesticide Spraying Notification Laws

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I was unable to attend the hearing about pesticide spraying notifications laws, but I want to let you know that these laws are important to me, and to many of my ill acquaintances. You see, I have multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS), and when I am exposed to pesticides and other chemicals, I get headaches and my thinking gets blurry. These symptoms are mild compared to others with this illness. Not long ago a Maine woman with MCS made national news when she was made homeless when the spraying of blueberry fields near her home made her too sick to pay her mortgage. The spraying worsened her illness so much that she was unable to find anyplace at all that was safe to live. There are people with this illness who live in tents in Arizona and New Mexico because they are so sensitized and there are so few places that are safe for them anymore.

More and more people are falling ill with multiple chemical sensitivity. As many as 10-30 percent of the population describe themselves as having symptoms triggered by chemicals in pesticides, perfumes, and cleaning products. There are 80,000 unregulated chemicals in the US. I believe that people like me are canaries in the coal mine, an early warning system to let others know we are making the air unsafe for all of us.

You can help make the air safer for people like me, and help protect others--including small children, whose bodies are more susceptible to chemicals--from acquiring my illness and others, including Parkinson's disease, some cancers, migraines, and behavioral problems. People have a right to know when the air around them is unsafe, just like nonsmokers have a right to clean air.

Thank you for considering my story when you deliberate on this important matter.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Lunden
Portland, Maine

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 7:39 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: FW: pesticide spray notification system
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Henry Jennings, Director
Maine Board of Pesticides Control
207-287-2731
henry.jennings@maine.gov

From: kmichka@aol.com [mailto:kmichka@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 29, 2010 11:20 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticide spray notification system

As a child of the '60s, growing up in the South, I can remember the smell of the mosquito fog truck that came rolling through our neighborhoods on a regular basis. Now that we have substantial indications that people of that generation are suffering from record numbers of cancers and autoimmune diseases which may be linked to chemical exposure, I think it is imperative for an individual to have the right to know when a pesticide will be sprayed around his or her safe haven of a house, and what type of chemical is being sprayed, so that precautions may be taken.

I absolutely support the creation of a neighborhood reporting and notification system of pesticide application for the residents of Maine.

Thank you for your good work on this important effort.
M. Kay Michka
16 Spruce Pond Road
New Portland, ME 04961

From: Clark Granger [mailto:clarkgranger@clinic.net]
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2010 8:25 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: BPC Working Paper: Development of a Comprehensive Notification Registry

Dear Henry,

I read with interest the "BPC Working Paper: Development of a Comprehensive Notification Registry" which appeared recently on your website. I have a few comments that I'd like to share with the Board and with your staff.

Under the "Logistics" section, there is reference to keeping the registry internet-based to keep administration manageable. Please do not forget that agricultural producers likewise need to keep their administration of registry matters manageable. The regulated community needs to know that when they send a properly addressed email to a notification registrant, they have complied in full with notification requirements, and not be burdened with follow ups to determine whether the notification was actually received. A response from the person notified should not be required as a means to assure that notification was made. There simply isn't time for applicators attempting to complete operations within a targeted spray window to waste with futile follow ups before proceeding to spray.

Also in the "Logistics" section, there is reference to the fact that the registry will (only) cover commercial agricultural producers and commercial applications. I cannot understand why the board's staff has dismissed unanimous stakeholder input, especially at the recent Portland hearing, that homeowners be required to notify. Folks testifying from the conventional agricultural community, the organic community, and the public all urged that homeowner applicators should make their neighbors aware of their spray plans. A decision to exempt homeowners seems to fly in the face of the ACF Committee's mandate to develop a truly comprehensive spray registry, and even flies in the face of the Board's own spray plane ad that promises citizens the right to "know about pesticides being sprayed near your home" as your ad puts it. And if the concern about chemical sensitivity is valid, it's difficult to understand why the Board should develop a policy that ignores this risk if a homeowner is doing the spraying.

And finally, in the "Logistics" section, I strenuously object to participants remaining on the registry until they notify you that they want to be removed, or you determine that their information is no longer valid. It would seem a simple matter for you to send an email request to registrants each year with a request to respond if they wish to remain on the registry, and simply delete names of those who do not respond by a certain date. It would be unconscionable to burden farmers with having to notify folks who have moved away, or who no longer care. I believe that if you can add names annually, you can delete names annually. And I question the likelihood that the Board will receive timely notice that registrants have moved from a notification area so their names may be removed.

I applaud your recommendations that air-carrier equipment notification distances be limited to 500 feet, and that non-powered applications by commercial agricultural producers be subject to notification requirements. But while I want to assist the Board however I may in its efforts to develop a workable comprehensive notification registry as it was directed by the ACF Committee, I personally do not favor this approach. I much prefer the system in existence before LD 1293 was introduced, which specified the "by-request" option, provided a workable registry for urban pest control applications, and provided a workable notification system for forest applications. I think that system was superior to anything presently proposed.

Thanks in advance for your consideration of my perspectives.

Respectfully,

Clark Granger

From: Cheryl Thompson [mailto:CherylThompson@webtv.net]
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2010 10:48 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Public Comment in Support of A Comprehensive Pesticides Registry and Notification

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I am writing you to express my opinion about the BPC's public process around pesticides notification rules and registries.

Pesticides are toxic chemicals, which have been linked to several serious diseases, like Parkinson's and Childhood Leukemia.

The public has the right to know about toxic chemicals where they live. I fell that a quarter mile is a reasonable notification distance.

I also believe that the requirement that all aerial pesticide applicators notify the public about spraying, which was authorized in 2009, should be restored immediately. It should not matter whether the sprayer is a farmer of golf club owner.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Cheryl Thompson
69 Beechwood Rd
Winthrop, ME 04364

From: Sarah O'Brien [mailto:sobrien@unum.com]
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2010 7:07 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Public Comment in Support of A Comprehensive Pesticides Registry and Notification

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I am writing you to express my opinion about the BPC's public process around pesticides notification rules and registries.

Pesticides are toxic chemicals, which have been linked to several serious diseases, like Parkinson's and Childhood Leukemia.

The public has the right to know about toxic chemicals where they live. I fell that a quarter mile is a reasonable notification distance.

I also believe that the requirement that all aerial pesticide applicators notify the public about spraying, which was authorized in 2009, should be restored immediately. It should not matter whether the sprayer is a farmer or golf club owner.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sarah O'Brien
7 Susan Avenue
Scarborough, ME 04074