
From: Mindy Aumann [mailto:mindyaumann@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 11:40 AM

To: Jennings, Henry

Subject: Re: Official State of Maine Business: Update on Maine Pesticide Notification Laws

I am disappointed that the law was changed to reduce the instances that need notifications. As a family with 2 asthmatics with chemical sensitivities, I would rather be told more than less to protect our health and to know when our symptoms might be from outdoor chemicals.

Anything that can be done to make notifications easier and less costly is appreciated. There are many ways to notify people that are low cost or free, with email lists being only one option.

--

Mindy Aumann

<http://mindyaumann.blogspot.com>

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

From: Bob & Sue Hachey [mailto:bobhachey@tds.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 12:23 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: aerial spraying

PLEASE have ALL persons spraying ANY chemicals notify the public within at least 2000 feet!!! 500 feet is a joke as we all know how even a gentle wind can spread the smoke of a woodstove for a very visible distance! Minute amounts of chemicals adversely effect our health. This is one reason why my family moved to Maine. We hoped to escape the pollution from careless companies, factories, and even "John Q Public". A very worried Grandmother who votes, Suzanne Hachey, Stetson, Maine.

From: Melissa Walsh Innes [mailto:melissawalshinnes@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 8:48 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Cc: 'Paul Tukey'; 'Ben Pratt'; veroniquemcaree@hotmail.com; 'Kristine Jenkins'; Cifrino, Carole A; 'Matt Prindiville'
Subject: public comment on pesticide notification changes

Hello Mr. Jennings,

I write to you today to express some of my concerns with the changes made to the pesticide notification registry, as well as some funding changes that I feel need to be addressed. First, I believe that the registry should be free for all people who choose to register. The fees to administer the program should be borne by the manufacturers who have produced this product of which is poison to humans. Why someone should have to pay \$20 to be notified that their neighbor is spraying poison into the air, and the manufacturer not responsible at all financially, is wrong. Also, manufacturers should pay for an educational outreach program to notify people about the existence of the registry, as many people are not aware that it exists. I disagree strongly with the exemptions that were made in this most recent legislation, and feel that the citizens of Maine were let down in their right to avoid contamination from dangerous pesticides. On a separate note, I do plan to introduce legislation in the next session regarding pesticide spraying in public locations, and will be following this issue closely. Thank you, and please register my remarks.

Maine State Representative Melissa Walsh Innes
Serving District 107 - Yarmouth

✉ melissawalshinnes@gmail.com
☎ 207.318.8742 (cell) 207.846.4302 (home)

Serving on the Legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources

From: William Leavenworth [mailto:william.leavenworth@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 11:58 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticide spraying

To whom it may concern:

Anyone spraying pesticides on or around my property should consider himself beyond the protection of the law, since obviously the law doesn't intend to protect me or mine from his pesticides. Does Monsanto own the legislature? Is everyone for sale in Augusta? Doesn't anyone remember what happened to the crustacean population in Long Island sound when pesticides got into the water system? Anything that kills at the cellular level kills far beyond the intended victim, and will doubtless also kill other insecta (for instance lobsters) when it reaches the ocean, as well as the avian species that actually feed on harmful insects. What a bunch of slimy useless idiots we have in the corporate lobby in Augusta. They should be flogged into quadriplegia and left to die on the steps of the Capitol as a warning to others.

Think this over again; any government that puts its people or their environment at risk to enrich corporations has forfeited its right to govern, and in turn risks being justifiably violently overthrown if the people organize themselves. Governments derive their JUST powers from the consent of the governed, as you may remember from civics class. They do NOT derive their just powers from the firepower of the police or the wealth of corporate lobbyists.

Very truly yours,

Dr. William Burgess Leavenworth, Ph.D.
Environmental Historian

From: Lorraine Taft [mailto:lorraine.taft@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 12:48 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Pesticide notification

I have Multiple Chemical Sensitivity and am personally very concerned with notification of aerial pesticide use in my community.

A competent notification system is critical to people who have chemical sensitivities. Inadvertent exposure leads to loss in function, increased health care expenses, and to a significant drop in the quality of life. I know how to protect myself from exposure but I need to be forewarned when the aerial spraying is planned so that I can do so. This need to know applies to any aerial spraying, both agricultural pesticides and those used by the state government for forest health, etc. Wind drift, ambient temperature and humidity all affect the process, as you know, and in all fairness, being advised of a scheduled spray is a small concession to people with the need to know.

When I lived in Maryland, along the Del Marva Peninsula in Cambridge, the state's system of notification worked very well for all aerial spraying notices. The notice came by individual phone notification, a taped announcement, for scheduled spraying within the complete county and was either the day before or the morning of. This allowed me to avoid accidental exposure. Florida had a similar system of notice. I am sure that Maine can develop a competent and cost effective system.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Taft
62 Cushing Road
Friendship, ME 04547
207-832-6241

From: Vicki Al Adams [mailto:vicki-adams@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 11:19 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticide notification

Dear Mr. Jennings,

I truly appreciate this effort to notify people of pesticide application.

Thank you,

Vicki Adams

From: tim case [mailto:timacase@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 6:02 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: comments on registry

Henry,
Per your correspondence of yesterday, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the registry that is in place and proposed for Maine. As one of the largest land owners in the Town of Kittery, we are enthusiastic about being better informed about pesticide use near the lands that we manage. Here are five comments to consider.

1. It should be optional to choose not to list one or more contact options which are often seen as private data, especially e-mail or phone. Both of these seem unnecessary to reveal for purposes of this registry while still providing cost-effective communications. For example a registrant might want a phone call or postal mail but not e-mail, or vice versa.
2. Better yet, for transparency of process, tracking trends, and maintaining some privacy of landowners, the registry should consider a simple alert feature. This would dramatically reduce the work of those spraying, and therefore increase the chances of compliance. An applicator would go on-line or otherwise submit a street address and/or lat-long coordinate along with date and other important information. The pesticide alert system would e-mail to neighboring registrants and post in an on-line database the pertinent information on the spray event. There does not need to be any direct communication between the applicant and registrants.
3. Using the existing registry on-line form, the input of property location is cumbersome at best and potentially significantly inaccurate. I would hope and assume that in short order the use of simple digital mapping and GIS tools would make this registry more effective. Working with Maine Office of GIS or other resources, you could create an easy on-line mapping component to help registrants identify properties being put into the registry. Very large properties could be delineated along with smaller house lot addresses.
4. The new 500-foot distance is useless when considering larger properties. For example, scores of landowners in Kittery (including my organization) have odd-shaped 20-acre or larger properties that are larger than 1000 feet to a side. It is unreasonable given the rudimentary tools provided by this registry system that applicators will contact all registry owners within 500 feet of their application.
5. It is unfortunate to have a delay in wide-spread adoption for two (or more) years.

Thank you for this opportunity, and if of interest I would be happy to discuss any of these points further.
Tim

Tim Case
Chair, Stewardship Committee
Kittery Land Trust
timacase@gmail.com

5/7/2010

Schlein, Paul B

From: Jennings, Henry
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 9:47 AM
To: Schlein, Paul B
Subject: Comments from Nancy Caudle-Johnson

Nancy Caudle-Johnson from Camden called today to convey her thoughts about development of a comprehensive registry. Nancy is currently on both of the BPC's registries and is also a licensed commercial pesticide applicator, although her company only uses organic pesticides as a last resort. Nancy favors combining the two registries and hoped there would be no fee for participating. She also commented that the BPC is doing a great job of educating the public about sustainable landscaping practices.

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

From: afrost [mailto:afrost@hughes.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 6:16 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Cc: Nathan Pennell; David Garcelon
Subject: Pesticide Notification Registry

Good Morning Henry,

Geneva Duncan-Frost here in Washington county. As someone who has scouted blueberry fields for 20+ years now I am very pleased that there is finally a notification requirement. It is long overdue. The biggest comment I have is how ridiculous the argument was that the processors did not have time to "search" out who the abbutters were.

As a licensed forester I know very well that every agricultural entity in Washington county knows exactly who owns what down here. The blueberry people have always sought out as many growers as they could, and could look at a map and tell you who every piece of land belonged too. And the loggers are the same. Every one has been vying for these same resources, either the blueberries or the wood, for a century. For the processors to say they don't have this info is an outright lie. They all have very sophisticated computer mapping software.

I think that an internet based system would be the best way to reach the bigger landmanagers. Any bb grower who participates in an ICM program costshared through NRCS already has digital maps stored for reference.

Again I am very pleased to see the progress that has been made over the last 20 years in growing the worlds best blueberry, without compromising the environment or the neighbors.

Thank you,

Geneva Duncan-Frost

Thursday, April 15, 2010

Interested Party –Pesticide Notification

We write to you today in reference to the newly signed law LD 1547, an Act to revise Notification Requirements for Pesticides Applications, so that the Maine State Pomological (apples) Society can stay engaged in the process. As stakeholders in this issue we first want to thank your board and the legislators who worked so thoughtfully on this issue and seek our input.

In a meeting held by our executive committee on the 14th of April our board went over the various questions that were posed in the Memorandum titled “Development of a Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry”; our responses are as followed:

Types of applications could be limited to aerial application, but realistically outside interested will force air carriers to remain in the current law.

Appropriate distance is a matter of great debate; however our industry feels that 250 feet from the last point of application is more than adequate. A quarter of a mile that was once advocated for is to far of a distance which seems to be more for making neighbors into alarmists and is not steeped in any data. Whatever distance is decided on, we ask that studies conducted in Maine are used in setting the standard and not a study done from across the nation that has different variables.

Posting signs are a concern only if they are extended past points of entry. Most orchards already have signage for worker protection law and for GAP certified practices.

The feasibility of developing a web based automated system doesn't seem realistic at this point. Money is tight across that state and trying to implement a system at this time is not needed. Although some features of this system will be helpful, our industry feels that this is also a way to track land managers use of the registry. It is easy to track whether or not a land manager has made a good faith effort, by just listening to complaints of neighbors who signed up and who were not notified. Following this principal we can curb costs until the registry gains more traction and this subject can be revisited at another time.

All orchardists agree that informing the public is important and good business since all abutters are potential customers. A member or our organization will be on hand for the next meeting set for April 16, 2010. We thank for asking for our input.

Steve Maheu
Acting President
Maine Pomological Society
Ricker Hill Orchards

Schlein, Paul B

From: Treble Ridge Farm [trebleridgefarm@myway.com]

Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010 11:30 AM

To: Schlein, Paul B

Subject: Re: Official State of Maine Business: Update on Maine Pesticide Notification Laws

I hope that the distance involved for requiring notification means the distance to my property line, not the distance to my home. As a certified organic commercial grower, I need to know when spraying activity might impact my gardens or cropland.

--Alice Percy
Treble Ridge Farm
Whitefield, ME

From: bethsehl@aol.com [mailto:bethsehl@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010 3:32 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: pesticide registry

Hello.

I received your recent memorandum on the possibility of new pesticide notification laws and am wondering how this change will affect me. I am presently on the non-agricultural pesticide registry. Will this registry cease to exist? Will I no longer have the right to be notified prior to pesticide use in my neighborhood?

Also, I am wondering if you will be having a information gathering meeting in my area of Maine (Kittery)?

Thanks.
Beth Sehlmeier



Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association

Common Ground Country Fair

**Statement of the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association
Delivered by Heather Spalding, Associate Director
Before the Maine Board of Pesticides Control
Public Hearing on the Scope and Operation of a
Comprehensive Pesticide Spray Notification Registry.
April 16, 2010**

Good morning Mr. Simonds and members of the Board of Pesticides Control (BPC). My name is Heather Spalding and I am the Associate Director of the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA), which has members in almost 7,000 homes and businesses in Maine and beyond.

Thank you very much for hosting this public hearing on the scope and operation of a comprehensive pesticide spray notification registry. We've all been working hard on this issue for many years now and we have made some progress, we've lost some ground, and we've identified some new goals.

MOFGA appreciates the time and effort that the members and staff of the BPC have dedicated to this effort. We especially want to commend the staff for developing and activating the notification registry for aerial and air carrier spraying. They have done an excellent job designing it, and have made it easily accessible to the public. We are hopeful and confident that an expansion of the scope of the registry will be accomplished quickly and logically.

The BPC's focus on this issue is helping to raise awareness about potential exposure to pesticides drift. Clearly, people are concerned about the health risks. When the public learned of the Ag Committee's intentions to gut the state's pesticide spray notification law, citizens responded in great numbers with phone calls, emails, personal visits and more than 1,200 faxes to Maine's legislators. And as you know, hundreds of people have enrolled in the registry because they want to know what pesticide drift they might be exposed to.

Scope

We are interested to hear the practical concerns that the BPC members and staff may have about the potential scope of the comprehensive registry. Comprehensive is a superlative and we certainly feel that the goal should be to bring all outdoor pesticide applications into the system, regardless of the sector in which they take place and the technologies being used.

Notification distances are likely to be the biggest controversy. While we strongly advocate for a consistent notification zone of 1,320 feet for all aerial and air carrier applications, we recognize that there may be different standards for other methods of application. We intend to spend more

*294 Crosby Brook Road, P.O. Box 170, Unity, Maine 04988 • Phone: (207) 568-4142
Fax: (207) 568-4141 • E-mail: mofga@mofga.org • Web: www.mofga.org*

time researching this, and we feel that this is an area where input from the public health sector will be of great value.

For years now we have heard a refrain from many among the regulated community - "We're happy to notify people about pesticide spraying. We regularly notify people who live far beyond the 500-foot requirement of Chapter 28. All people have to do is ask." Well, the registry has set up a simple system to help people "just ask." Then, in the Legislative process, the message from some seemed to change to "notifying neighbors about pesticide spraying only serves to alarm them unnecessarily." It's more of a "Don't ask, don't tell" approach. Land managers must not decide how much or little information neighbors should have. People want to protect their families from pesticide spray drift and notification is minimal protection.

We welcome this opportunity to move beyond the focus of aerial and air carrier spraying. While those application technologies are the most dramatic and noticeable, we know that pesticides can volatilize and drift even when directed downward at short range under optimum climatic conditions. The Environmental Protection Agency has convened a scientific advisory panel to assess the problems of volatilization drift recognizing that post-application drift is a real public and environmental health problem, as well as a threat to the livelihood of organic farmers. You probably have heard of the court case in California in which an organic herb farmer brought a successful one million dollar lawsuit against pesticide applicators whose organophosphate spraying of Brussels sprouts resulted in serious drift contamination.

While we are enthusiastic about the expansion of the notification registry, we urge you first to resolve the non-agricultural application exemptions that the Legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry (ACF) instituted.

One of the biggest disappointments of the final version of LD 1547 was the section on "Applicability". This section exempts land managers from having to consult the registry when making non-agricultural pesticide applications using aerial or air carrier technologies. It also exempts land managers from having to consult the registry if they already comply with the terms of the suburban registry for which registrants pay \$20 annually. This section is completely unnecessary, arbitrary and confusing. LD 1293 was about technology, not the sector in which technology was used. It was never intended to be a bill about agriculture.

Hundreds of people in Maine have signed up for the registry expecting to be notified regardless of the context in which aerial or air carrier spraying happens. The ACF drastically changed the terms of the registry in midstream. The BPC now has an opportunity to correct this error and instill trust in the registrants who have proactively sought notification.

Please prioritize work on Chapter 51 and make the notification zone consistent at 1,320 feet. This distance was based on the precedent of New Hampshire notification law, as well as protective buffer zones in many of California's most agriculture-intensive counties. Land managers whose activities are subject to Chapter 51 would have only to consult the registry to determine whether there are additional people within a quarter mile who would like to be notified.

Also, please return the notification distance to 1,320 feet for orchardists and Christmas tree growers. Keep it consistent for aerial and air carrier technologies. There is evidence of chlorpyrifos contamination in homes 400 meters from orchards where the pesticides are applied.

This study was conducted by the Department of Environmental Health, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle; the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health in Atlanta.

Think of a quarter mile notification zone as a neighborhood. A quarter mile is the distance in which families might go for a walk with their dogs, or the range in which kids might ride their bikes to friends' houses.

Operation

Rachel Carson wrote in *Silent Spring*, "When taxpayers understand that the bill for spraying the town roads should come due only once a generation instead of once a year they will surely rise up and demand a change of method."

It is unfortunate that Maine taxpayers have to pay for publicity about our registry but that is the wish of the Legislature's Ag Committee at this time. We still feel that land managers setting pesticides drift in motion have a responsibility to let all their neighbors know, at least in very general terms.

We do have confidence that the BPC will take the responsibility of indirect notification seriously. It already has. To fulfill the Legislature's requirement of reporting back on the efficacy of the program, we suggest conducting a random sample of awareness of the registry around the state. Or, the BPC could purchase a question or two on a statewide survey once each year.

Knowing that \$25,000 is a modest advertising budget, especially where television is concerned, we encourage the BPC to develop and pitch public service announcements and to get other branches of Maine government, particularly the Centers for Disease Control, to help get out the word through agency websites and other means. Also, it would be worth requesting that notices go out to residents with tax bills. MOFGA is helping to promote awareness of the registry, as are other members of Maine's Environmental Priorities Coalition and the Alliance for a Clean and Healthy Maine.

MOFGA is willing to help evaluate technological opportunities and software for developing an internet-based notification system. Many complained that they couldn't possibly notify all the neighbors of sprayed areas. An automated system would eliminate any burden, perceived or real, by requiring the land manager to make a single phone call or send a single email to the BPC.

One easy way that the land managers could be more proactive in informing neighbors is by posting land that will be sprayed. A simple posting requirement could look like this:

- * A poster shall be posed conspicuously at least two weeks prior to the planned spray activity and shall not be removed by the land manager for at least 2 days (48 hours) after spray activity ceases.
- * The poster shall have a standardized template designed by the Board of Pesticides Control, and contain the information required in Section 2A1-6.
- * Areas that shall be posted include federal, state, municipal and private roads open to the public bordering or leading into the intended spray area, utility crossings of these roads and any place a maintained public trail enters the application site.

- * Posters shall be posed at intervals no less than 300 feet along property boundaries visible to the public.

Finally, I would like to draw your attention to two attachments. One is a summary of recent studies and news stories showing the links between pesticide exposure and serious human and environmental health problems. At least two members of the Legislature's Ag Committee refuse to believe that pesticides are a threat to public health. They dismiss the growing body of evidence as "emotional hype" and "junk science." We think you will appreciate the credentials associated with each of these peer-reviewed studies and we look forward to future hearings that will focus on public health. The second attachment is a list of the organizations that support a strong pesticide spray notification law. Each of these groups endorsed the original version of LD 1547 when it went to the Legislature last January. MOFGA attends BPC meetings regularly, but you don't often have the opportunity to hear from other groups.

Thank you very much for your service and for your consideration of MOFGA's remarks.

[SUBMITTED BY MOFGA]

Why People Want To Know About Pesticide Spraying In Their Neighborhoods

Pesticides can cause birth defects, cancer, asthma, developmental disabilities, and even death. They also can contaminate organically grown produce, making it unfit to market as organic and leading to economic losses.

Pesticide spray drift can travel great distances – even miles – depending on the application method, the surrounding terrain, and the weather.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention tell us that the majority of people in the U.S. have detectable concentrations of multiple pesticide residues in their bodies.

The U.S. Geological Survey reports that 90 percent of all fish, 100 percent of all streams, 33 percent of major aquifers, and 50 percent of shallow wells contain one or more pesticides at detectable levels.

Maine has no meaningful pesticide spray buffer zones to protect families and organic crops from pesticides drift. The least land owners can do is to let their neighbors know when they intend to spray using aerial or air carrier technologies.

Scientific studies regularly link pesticides exposure to human and environmental health problems. Below are references to recent scientific studies and news stories about adverse health impacts of pesticides exposure. This is why people want to know. They want to protect their families.

Epigenetics. Michael Skinner of Skinner Laboratory at Washington State University is conducting research on the ability of environmental toxicants (i.e. endocrine disruptors) to modify local cell-cell interactions in the testis and ovary. An interview with Dr. Skinner is available on the website of scienwatch.com :
<http://sciencewatch.com/ana/st/epigen/09marEpiSkin/>
Skinner's website is: <http://www.skinner.wsu.edu/research.html>

Farm pesticides linked to skin cancer. The Ecologist. April 7, 2010. Large-scale study highlights agricultural chemicals as a possible risk factor behind rising rates of melanoma in the US. Repeated exposure to pesticides can increase the risk of developing skin cancer, according to research conducted on farm workers in the US. The study looked at more than 55,000 pesticide sprayers working in Iowa and North Carolina and asked them to detail their exposure to 50 pesticides. Using that data researchers were able to compare their cancer rates with their use of certain pesticides. Six chemicals in all, including two fungicides (Benomyl and Maneb/mancozeb) and two insecticides (Carbaryl and methyl/ethyl parathion) were found to double the risk of developing skin cancer with repeated exposure of more than 50 lifetime days. The study, entitled "Pesticide use and cutaneous melanoma in pesticide applicators in the

Agricultural Health Study," was conducted by researchers from the University of Iowa, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Cancer Institute, and reported last month in the journal *Environmental Health Perspectives*. See the report at:
<http://ehp03.niehs.nih.gov/article/fetchArticle.action?articleURI=info%3Adoi%2F10.1289%2Fehp.0901518>

Delays seen in children exposed to pesticides before birth. *Environmental Health News*. April 6, 2010. The study reports that prenatal – but not current – pesticide exposure affects children’s neurodevelopment and blood pressure at ages 6 to 8. Children exposed to insecticides before birth through their mothers – who worked in the flower growing industry – were up to two years behind in thinking, learning and memory abilities when they reached ages 6 to 8 years old, finds a study of children from northern Ecuador. They also had higher blood pressures. The results mimic those of a pilot study done by the same research group and agree with a growing body of evidence that suggests fetal exposure to pesticides during development – especially during certain windows – is of concern. The study, entitled “Neurobehavioral Deficits and Increased Blood Pressure in School-Age Children Prenatally Exposed to Pesticides”, was conducted by an international research team led by Philippe Grandjean, M.D., from the University of Southern Denmark and Harvard School of Public Health. It was published by *Environmental Health Perspectives*. See the report:
<http://ehp03.niehs.nih.gov/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1289%2Fehp.0901582>

Bee Die-Offs Worsened by Winter, Pesticides. *Discovery News*. March 24, 2010. The mysterious 4-year-old crisis of disappearing honeybees is deepening. A quick federal survey indicates a heavy bee die-off this winter, while a new study shows honeybees' pollen and hives laden with pesticides. The study finds 121 different types of pesticides within 887 wax, pollen, bee and hive samples from 23 states. The top 10 most frequently detected pesticides are fluvalinate and coumaphos, chlorpyrifos, chlorothalonil, amitraz, pendamethalin, endosulfan, fenprothrin, esfenvalerate and atrazine. Miticides are the most common contaminant in the wax and bees, and fungicides are the most common contaminant of pollen. The study, entitled “High Levels of Miticides and Agrochemicals in North American Apiaries: Implications for Honey Bee Health” was conducted by researchers from Penn State University, USDA, and the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. It was published in the scientific journal *Public Library of Sciences*. See the report at:
<http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0009754>

Link Between Pesticide Chlorpyrifos Exposure And Childhood Developmental Delays. *Medical News Today*. March 22, 2010. Exposure to the pesticide chlorpyrifos - which is banned for use in U.S. households but is still widely used throughout the agricultural industry - is associated with early childhood developmental delays, according to a study by researchers at Columbia University's Mailman School of Public Health. The study, entitled *Chlorpyrifos Exposure and Urban Residential Environment Characteristics as*

Determinants of Early Childhood Neurodevelopment," was published online and will be published in the May issue of the American Journal of Public Health. Download the study at:

<http://ajph.aphapublications.org/cgi/content/abstract/AJPH.2009.168419v1?maxtoshow=&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&fulltext=Chlorpyrifos+Exposure+and+Urban+Residential+Environment+Characteristics+as+Deter&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&resourcetype=HWCIT>

Weedkiller in waterways can change frogs' sex traits. The Washington Post. March 2, 2010. Study entitled, "Atrazine induces complete feminization and chemical castration in male African clawed frogs (*Xenopus laevis*)." Led by Tyrone Hayes, PhD, at the University of California, Berkeley and published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. The study demonstrates that atrazine-exposed genetic males developed into functional females that copulated with unexposed males and produced viable eggs. "It's a chemical . . . that causes hormone havoc," Dr. Hayes said. "You need to look at things that are affecting wildlife, and realize that, biologically, we're not that different." See the full report at:

<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2010/02/12/0909519107.abstract>

Pesticide Use and Thyroid Disease Among Women in the Agricultural Health Study.

Published in the American Journal of Epidemiology, January 8, 2010. This study shows that wives of agricultural pesticide applicators have a significantly increased risk of developing thyroid disease. See the report abstract at:

<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/171/4/455>

Shoes Off at the Door? New Reasons Why. [Pesticides in the dust.] The Huffington Post. February 19, 2010. The California State Department of Public Health, researchers with the Center for the Health Assessment of Mothers and Children of Salinas, and the University of California, Berkeley recently concluded that 22 pesticides are commonly found in the dust of homes in Salinas, California. The Environmental Protection Agency and National Institute of Environmental Health have found that low level chronic pesticide exposure as found in these homes can cause numerous health problems, especially for fetuses and young children. See an abstract of the study, Pesticides in Dust from Homes in an Agricultural Area, at:

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es9020958>

Second Layton girl dies in case of possible pesticide poisoning. The Salt Lake Tribune.

February 10, 2010. Investigators are tying the deaths of 4-year and 15-month old sisters in Layton, Utah to Fumitoxin aluminum phosphide pellets used to kill voles in their family's front yard. The chemical wafted into the family's home where National Guard crews detected phosphine concentrations of 30 parts per million. Concentrations of 50 parts per million can be life-threatening for a 150-pound adult. In 1998, a coalition led by the tobacco industry beat back the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's proposed

regulations that, in effect, would have banned the residential use of aluminum phosphide.

Link Between Birth Defect Gastroschisis and the Agricultural Chemical Atrazine Found. Science Daily. February 7, 2010. Study led by Sarah Waller, PhD, of the University of Washington, Seattle. Living near farms that use the weed killer atrazine increases the risk of a rare birth defect, according to a study presented February 5, 2010 at the annual meeting of the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine in Chicago. The researchers found that the closer a mother lived to a site of high surface water contamination with atrazine the more likely she was to deliver an infant with gastroschisis, a rare birth defect in which an infant's intestines stick out of the body through a defect on one side of the umbilical cord. The birth defect occurs more often among infants who live less than 15 miles from one of these sites, and it occurs more often among babies conceived between March and May, when agricultural pesticide use is common.

Childhood Brain Tumors, Residential Insecticide Exposure, and Pesticide Metabolism Genes. Environmental Health Perspectives. Researchers from Public Health Sciences Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington; Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center/Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California; Center for Ecogenetics and Environmental Health, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle; Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California; Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle. The study concludes that exposures during pregnancy and childhood to insecticides that target the nervous system, such as organophosphates (OPs) and carbamates, are associated with childhood brain tumors. The researchers hypothesize that this susceptibility might be increased in children with genetic variations that affect the metabolism of these chemicals.

Children susceptible to pesticides longer than expected, study finds. UC Berkeley News, June 22, 2009. Although it is known that infants are more susceptible than adults to the toxic effects of pesticides, this increased vulnerability may extend much longer into childhood than expected. Among newborns, levels of paraoxonase 1 (PON1), an enzyme critical to the detoxification of organophosphate pesticides, average one-third or less than those of the babies' mothers. It was thought that PON1 enzyme activity in children approached adult levels by age two, but instead, the UC Berkeley researchers found that the enzyme level remained low in some individuals through age seven. Based upon the findings, reported in the journal Environmental Health Perspectives, the study authors recommend that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) re-evaluate the current standards for acceptable levels of pesticide exposure.

Pesticide Use Linked to Higher Risk of Pre-Cancerous Multiple Myeloma. National Cancer Institute – U.S. National Institutes of Health. May 29, 2009. The study found that men who used pesticides occupationally, particularly farmers, had a nearly two-fold increased risk of a well-established precursor for multiple myeloma--monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance - when compared to men not exposed to pesticides through their job. These findings add support to the hypothesis that pesticides are biologically linked to the development of multiple myeloma.

Pesticide Exposure Found To Increase Risk Of Parkinson's Disease. Science Daily. April 22, 2009. Reporting in the April 15 issue of the American Journal of Epidemiology, Beate Ritz, professor of epidemiology at the UCLA School of Public Health, and Sadie Costello, a former doctoral student at UCLA who is now at the University of California, Berkeley, found that Central Valley [CA] residents who lived within 500 meters of fields sprayed between 1974 and 1999 had a 75-percent increased risk for Parkinson's.

Rural Well Water Linked to Parkinson's Disease: California finding bolsters theory linking neurological ailment to insecticides. Scientific American. August 5, 2009. A recent study, led by UCLA epidemiology professor Beate Ritz, and published in the journal Environmental Health Perspectives has added to evidence that certain pesticides significantly increase one's risk of developing Parkinson's disease (PD). Researchers found that rural residents who drank private well water within 500 meters of fields sprayed with certain pesticides had an increased - up to 90 percent - risk of developing PD, and those with Parkinson's "were more likely to have consumed private well water, and had consumed it on average 4.3 years longer."

Time of conception linked to birth defects in United States. E Science News. March 30, 2009. A study, led by Paul Winchester, M.D., Indiana University School of Medicine professor of clinical pediatrics, and published in the April 2009 issue of the medical journal Acta Paediatrica is the first to report that birth defect rates in the United States were highest for women conceiving in the spring and summer. The researchers also found that this period of increase risk correlated with increased levels of pesticides in surface water across the United States. See the abstract:

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/121654269/abstract?CRETRY=1&SRETRY=0>

Pancreatic cancer linked to herbicides. Science News. May 28, 2009. Two commonly used herbicides, pendimethalin and EPTC, show a statistically significant exposure-response association with pancreatic cancer. The study, "Agricultural Pesticide Use And Pancreatic Cancer Risk In The Agricultural Health Study Cohort," published in the International Journal of Cancer, is a case-control study of pesticide applicators and their spouses in Iowa and North Carolina. After controlling for age, smoking and diabetes, the study finds a three-fold increased risk with lifetime pendimethalin use and a two-and-a-half-fold increased risk with lifetime use of EPTC when compared to those that

never used the chemicals. Among the 24 pesticides examined, having ever used one of five pesticides (trifluralin, chlorimuron-ethyl, pendimethalin, EPTC or heptachlor) shows at least a 40 percent excess risk of pancreatic cancer.

Weed killer kills human cells. Study intensifies debate over 'inert' ingredients. Environmental Health News. June 22, 2009. A study published by the American Chemical Society found that one of the so-called "inert" ingredients in the popular herbicide product Roundup can kill human cells, particularly embryonic, placental and umbilical cord cells. Over 4,000 inert ingredients are approved for use in the U.S. and can be mixed with pesticide "active" ingredients; however these chemicals are not disclosed to consumers or users on pesticide product labels due to EPA's interpretation (many would say incorrect interpretation) of federal pesticide law. Many inerts are classified as highly toxic, while others have not been adequately studied.

Pesticides Can Increase Suicidal Thoughts. Discover Magazine. October 22, 2009. Researchers from Tongde Hospital Zhejiang Province and King's College London studied residents of central and coastal China and found the first epidemiological evidence to suggest possible effects [of pesticides] on suicidal thoughts. The study suggests that higher exposure to organophosphate pesticides might actually increase the risk of suicidal thoughts. The study further provides support for calls for tighter international restrictions on agricultural pesticide availability and use.

Insecticides May Raise Risk of Lupus, RA. Study Shows Increased Risk of Autoimmune Diseases in Women Who Use Insecticides. WebMD. October 20, 2009. This study shows that women who use insecticides are at elevated risk for autoimmune diseases such as rheumatoid arthritis and lupus. The results of the yet unpublished study were presented on October 17, 2009 at the American College of Rheumatology annual meeting in Philadelphia, PA. The study, which looked at more than 75,000 women, shows that those who spray insecticides at least six times per year have almost two and a half times the risk of developing lupus and rheumatoid arthritis versus those who do not use insecticides. The risk doubles if insecticides were used in the home for 20 years or more.

Tiny pesticide exposure during pregnancy can have long-term impact on female offspring. Rodale Institute. November 2009. According to a study by researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, exposure to low levels of the organophosphate insecticide chlorpyrifos during pregnancy can impair learning, change brain function and alter thyroid levels of offspring into adulthood for tested mice, especially females. The report, entitled "Long-term sex selective hormonal and behavior alterations in mice exposed to low doses of chlorpyrifos in utero," was published by Elsevier. It can be downloaded here:

<http://www.zoology.wisc.edu/faculty/Por/pdfs/mice.pdf>

Environmental Contaminants in our Drinking Water, Breast Milk and Our Babies: How Worried Should We Be? Presentation by Dr. Paul Winchester, MD, Indiana University School of Medicine. August 25, 2008. One of Dr. Winchester's findings is an association between seasonal spikes in pesticide levels and children being born with spina bifida.

Video can be seen here:

<http://online.wr.usgs.gov/colloquium/aug08.html>

This summary compiled by the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA). For more information, please contact Heather Spalding at MOFGA - heathers@mofga.org or 207-568-4142.

[SUBMITTED BY MOFGA]

The following public health and conservation groups endorse a strong pesticide spray notification as outlined in the original version of LD 1547, submitted to the Maine Legislature in January 2010.

- American Lung Association of New England
- Appalachian Mountain Club
- Atlantic Salmon Federation
- Bicycle Coalition of Maine
- Conservation Law Foundation
- Environmental Health Strategy Center
- Environment Maine
- Friends of Casco Bay
- Learning Disabilities Association of Maine
- Maine Audubon
- Maine Center for Economic Policy
- Maine Congress of Lake Associations
- Maine Council of Trout Unlimited
- Maine Labor Group on Health
- Maine League of Conservation Voters
- Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association
- Maine People's Resource Center
- Maine Rivers
- Maine Women's Policy Center
- Natural Resources Council of Maine
- Northern Forest Alliance
- Physicians for Social Responsibility/Maine Chapter
- Planned Parenthood of Northern New England
- RESTORE: The North Woods
- Maine Chapter of the Sierra Club
- The Ocean Conservancy
- The Wilderness Society
- Toxics Action Center

From: Jane McCarthy [mailto:maire1@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 12:16 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Suggestions for New Comprehensive Directory

Hello!

I recently received a notice telling of a new law mandating a comprehensive outdoor pesticide notification registry. This seems like a great idea. The memorandum suggested that constructive suggestions would be welcome. Several ideas have occurred to me over the past few years, and I'd like to pass them along to you.

1. My biggest concern is the time frame allowed for notification of a pesticide/herbicide. The lower limit is only six hours, which in many cases could be totally inadequate. People with severe Multiple Chemical Sensitivity (also known as Environmental Illness) are usually chronically, severely ill, and six hours may not be enough for such a person to either seal their house, or to arrange to evacuate. Also, as a note may simply be affixed to the door, a person with this illness who is having a bad day may be unable to get out of bed to even find the notice, let alone take steps for his or her protection. A lower time limit of 48, or better yet, 72 hours would be much safer.
2. The exemptions section in the notification to be send to neighbors leaves much to be desired. I don't know if it will be within the scope of the proposed bill to tighten up this area, but many of the exceptions to notification (especially "b", "e", "f" and "g") refer to substances which can be, to the person with MCS/EI, as toxic as pesticides and herbicides. Would it be possible to stipulate that these products also be included, at least for actual abutters? I am especially worried about things such as Round-Up Weed Killer, & most paints, varnishes, stains and sealants. I live in a neighborhood of many individual little houses, each on a very small lot; there are 75+ houses within 250 feet of my home, many of which are duplexes. If hand-applied toxic sprays (insect or weed killers), or paint/stain etc., were to be applied on a property several houses away, I'd have no way of knowing it in time to protect myself. I do try to keep an eye on the houses which are visible from my own home, and several times have become aware of a painting project in time to avoid going outside. However, most of the properties on my notification list are not visible from my windows. In addition, it would be easy to miss someone spraying a toxic pesticide, even in the yard next door.
3. In my neighborhood (described above), at any given time several of the houses on my notification list are for sale, especially as there are many absentee landlords, who will rent their property as an investment. Thus, a house may be sold after the notification letter has gone out to my neighbors, and the new owners will be unaware of my situation. Is there a readily accessible, frequently updated place to easily find out about all sales in a given area? Alternatively, could real estate agents be required inform Registry participants of any sale once it is final? While sales which are handled by the seller, without the involvement of a real estate agent, would not be covered by such a requirement, it would cover most of the ownership changes. Another suggestion would be to somehow change the real estate law to compel every seller to notify the buyer if they have received a notification letter from the person on the Registry.
4. While the information on the first page of the notification to be given to neighbors is very good, I expect that many people are not going to read it all. Would it be possible, therefore, to at least list the pesticide examples given in bold print, or otherwise make them noticeable? Additionally, possibly a similarly highlighted list of some of the effects, both physical and neurological, of pesticides on people with MCS/EI would be useful, as this illness is so little known.

It may not be possible to address any of the above concerns at this time, but I send them along for what they are worth. They are all issues which are of great concern to me.

I want to thank everyone connected with the Maine Pesticide Registry for all their hard work. The service you provide is of enormous benefit to my health, as well as to my peace of mind.

Gratefully,
Jane M. McCarthy
7 Halstead Street,
Kittery, ME 03904-1218
(207) 439-8707

From: Rob Stenger [mailto:robstenger@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 04, 2010 12:15 PM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Re: Board Seeks Input on Comprehensive Pesticide Notification Registry

Dear Mr. Jennings and the Maine Board of Pesticide Control,

In response to your solicitation of public comments concerning the implementation of Public Law 2009, Chapter 584, LD 1547, I would like to offer the following input:

As a recreational beekeeper, notice of ANY kind of pesticide spraying is of vital importance to the well-being of my hives. As such, I am opposed to the exemption of non-agricultural pesticide permits from the notification registry.

Moreover, honeybees usually travel up to 3 miles from their hive in search of pollen and nectar sources. Thus, the reduction of notification requirements for fruit tree applications to a mere 500 feet is ludicrously insufficient.

I am in favor of combining the two registries, as this seems like an efficient method of notification and because other apiarists such as myself are not concerned with whether or not the pesticides are being for agricultural purposes, merely with the effects on our bees. An automated internet system for delivering these notifications would also be efficacious compared to a postal mail system, at least for those registrants who are able to receive e-mail.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope that in light of the worldwide decline in honeybee populations which has been linked to increased pesticide use and the catastrophic consequences of their continued decline, that the Board will do all in it's power to safeguard these valuable pollinators in the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Rob Stenger
863 River Rd
St. George, ME 04860

Louisa Enright, PhD
24 Howe Hill Road
Camden, Maine 04843
207-236-6215

May 11, 2010

Statement for Maine Pesticide Control Board Members

Two events in the past few weeks must alter the decision process of the Maine Pesticide Control Board.

1. Blueberries landed for the first time on the “dirty dozen” list of chemically tainted produce. At position 5, blueberries fell just behind apples (4) and before potatoes (11). Apples, blueberries, and potatoes are major crops for Maine farmers. Being on the “dirty dozen” list is not good for business.
2. And, The President’s Cancer Panel (PCP) released its 200-page 2010 report entitled “Reducing Environmental Cancer Risk: What We Can Do Now.” Nicholas D. Kristof, in a May 6, 2010, opinion piece in the NEW YORK TIMES noted that this three-member panel has the reputation of being “the Mount Everest of the medical mainstream.” One seat is currently vacant, but the two current members were appointed by former President George W. Bush. Dr. LaSalle Leffall Jr., is an oncologist and professor of surgery at Howard University; Dr. Margaret Kripke is an immunologist at the M. D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston.

Board members must now put aside the notion that because federal regulatory organizations have registered chemicals that they are safe. This report makes very clear that our regulatory systems regarding chemicals are deeply broken, that we are putting ourselves and, more importantly, our children at great risk, and that we must adopt precautionary measures rather than using reactionary measures—which means waiting until sufficient maiming and killing has taken place—with regard to the 80,000 improperly tested chemicals we are dispersing with impunity. The report can be found at http://deainfo.nci.nih.gov/advisory/pcp/pcp08-09rpt/PCP_Report_08-09_508.pdf. Or, at <http://pcp.cancer.gov> .

In 2009 alone, this report states, 1.5 million people were diagnosed with cancer, and 562,000 people died of cancer. Today, some 41 percent of Americans will be diagnosed with cancer in their life times. Some cancer rates are increasing, especially among cancers that are common among children. Indeed, from 1975–2006, cancer incidence in U.S. children under 20 years of age has increased.

Further, the panel states in its Executive Summary that “a growing body of research documents myriad established and suspected environmental factors linked to genetic, immune, and endocrine dysfunction that can lead to cancer and other diseases.”

And, in their letter to President Obama, the panel states the following: “The Panel was particularly concerned to find that the true burden of environmentally induced cancer has been grossly underestimated. With nearly 80,000 chemicals on the market in the United States, many of which are used by millions of Americans in their daily lives and are un- or understudied and largely unregulated, exposure to potential environmental carcinogens is widespread.”

These figures and this situation includes you, Pesticide Control Board Members, and me. It includes all of our spouses, our children, our grandchildren, and our friends and neighbors. If you do not already know it, dying from cancer is an arduous ordeal and accompanying someone on the cancer road is gut-wrenching emotionally and expensive economically.

With regard to the economics of cancer, the Panel writes in the Overview section: “Apart from the incalculable suffering and personal loss cancer causes patients and their families, cancer also exacts a heavy economic toll on the nation. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) estimates that in 2009, cancer cost the nation \$243.4 billion—\$99 billion for direct medical costs, \$19.6 billion for indirect morbidity costs (cost of lost productivity due to illness), and \$124.8 billion for indirect mortality costs (cost of lost productivity due to premature death).”

With regard to broken regulation mechanisms, the panel writes in the Executive Summary: “U.S. regulation of environmental contaminants is rendered ineffective by five major problems: (1) inadequate funding and insufficient staffing, (2) fragmented and overlapping authorities coupled with uneven and decentralized enforcement, (3) excessive regulatory complexity, (4) weak laws and regulations, and (5) undue industry influence. Too often, these factors, either singly or in combination, result in agency dysfunction and a lack of will to identify and remove hazards.”

With regard to consistent measurements for chemical toxins, in its Overview, the Panel states the following: “The U.S. does not use most of the international measures, standards, or classification structures for environmental toxins that have broad acceptance in most other countries. Instead, U.S. agencies have developed their own metrics and systems for quantifying environmental exposures, with standards that often are less stringent than international equivalents. With a global scientific community, multinational employers, and a worldwide marketplace, these differences increase the difficulty of comparing research findings and conducting international commerce.”

With regard to the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976, the Panel states the following: TSCA “may be the most egregious example of ineffective regulation of environmental contaminants. This legislation was intended to give EPA authority to control health risks from chemicals in commerce. TSCA grandfathered in approximately 62,000 chemicals; today, more than 80,000 chemicals are in use, and 1,000–2,000 new chemicals are created and introduced into the environment each year. Yet TSCA does not include a true proof-of-safety provision. At this time, neither industry nor government confirm the safety of existing or new chemicals prior to their sale and use. In fact, because companies are required by TSCA section 8e to report information about known health hazards caused by any of their products, to avoid litigation or the costly ban or restricted use of a product, chemical companies generally do not conduct toxicity tests. Under TSCA, EPA can only require testing if it can verify that the chemical poses a health risk to the public. Since TSCA was passed, EPA has required testing of less than 1 percent of the chemicals in commerce and has issued regulations to control only five existing chemicals. Companies are required to provide health and safety data for new chemicals and to periodically renew approvals for the use of pesticides, but historically, chemical manufacturers have successfully claimed that much of the requested submissions are confidential, proprietary information. As a result, it is almost impossible for scientists and environmentalists to challenge the release of new chemicals.”

With regard to the role of industry, in its section on the impact of industry, the Panel states the following: “Industry has exploited regulatory weaknesses, such as government’s reactionary (rather than precautionary) approach to regulation. Likewise, industry has exploited government’s use of an outdated methodology for assessing “attributable fractions” of the cancer burden due to specific environmental exposures. This methodology has been used effectively by industry to justify introducing untested chemicals into the environment.”

With regard to agricultural contaminants, the panel writes: “The entire U.S. population is exposed on a daily basis to numerous agricultural chemicals, some of which also are used in residential and commercial landscaping. Many of these chemicals have known or suspected carcinogenic or endocrine-disrupting properties. Pesticides (insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides) approved for use by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contain nearly 900 active ingredients, many of which are toxic. Many of the solvents, fillers, and other chemicals listed as inert ingredients on pesticide labels also are toxic, but are not required to be tested for their potential to cause chronic diseases such as cancer. In addition to pesticides, agricultural fertilizers and veterinary pharmaceuticals are major contributors to water pollution, both directly and as a result of chemical processes that form toxic by-products when these substances enter the water supply. Farmers and their families, including migrant workers, are at highest risk from agricultural exposures. Because agricultural chemicals often are applied as mixtures, it has been difficult to clearly distinguish cancer risks associated with individual agents.”

With regard to farmers, their families, farm workers, and chemical sprayers, the panel writes the following: “Leukemia rates are consistently elevated among children who grow up on farms, among children whose parents used pesticides in the home or garden, and among children of pesticide applicators.” And, “farmers and pesticide applicators have significantly higher prostate cancer risk, and female spouses have a significantly higher incidence of melanoma. Female pesticide applicators have significantly higher incidence of ovarian cancer.” And, “nearly 1,400 pesticides have been registered (i.e., approved) by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for agricultural and non-agricultural use. Exposure to these chemicals has been linked to brain/central nervous system (CNS), breast, colon, lung, ovarian (female spouses), pancreatic, kidney, testicular, and stomach cancers, as well as Hodgkin and non-Hodgkin lymphoma, multiple myeloma, and soft tissue sarcoma. Pesticide-exposed farmers, pesticide applicators, crop duster pilots, and manufacturers also have been found to have elevated rates of prostate cancer, melanoma, other skin cancers, and cancer of the lip.”

With regard to toxic drift, the Panel writes the following: “Agricultural chemicals can be carried far from their application sites by wind and through soil and groundwater contamination.” Indeed, Dr. Sandra Steingraber, who is quoted in the report writes in her book *LIVING DOWNSTREAM*, that “in general, less than 0.1 percent of pesticides applied for pest control actually reach their target pests, leaving 99.9 percent to move into the general environment. Some runs into water, some binds to soil, and some rises into the air.” This reality can only be called toxic trespass.

With regard to Atrazine, which the Panel describes as a “widely used herbicide believed to have endocrine-disrupting and possible carcinogenic properties” and which is used on Maine blueberries, the panel notes that Atrazine “was banned by the EU in October 2003 because of its ubiquitous and unpreventable water contamination.” That same month, the EPA approved the continued use of atrazine in the U.S. The panel also notes that “approximately 80 million pounds of atrazine are applied annually in the U.S.—more than any other agricultural pesticide.” Sadly, “atrazine is used to increase crop yields by preventing weeds from growing and stealing nutrients from the crop,” yet “some evidence suggests that eliminating its use would have little impact on usable crop levels.” The EPA is now reviewing atrazine again; a report should be released in Sept. 2010

In summary, it is very clear that we cannot continue down this present road of chemical use. Pesticide Control Board Members must understand now that their primary responsibility to all the citizens of this state must be to protect them from harm. This duty must supercede all other considerations. The problem at hand, thus, is not so much a chemical spraying registry and how far it should extend, but in stopping the use of untested, toxic, dangerous chemicals.

Since consumers, especially parents, are urged by the Panel not to “buy food that has not been sprayed or grown with chemical fertilizers,” a message that is increasing in frequency and volume, the implications for the Maine economy are inescapable. We must change chemical practices, and we must change now. And, the Maine Pesticide Control Board has to take up the challenge of helping Mainers do it.

Sincerely,

Louisa Enright

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

From: Marsha Smith [mailto:marsha@midcoast.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 7:38 AM
To: Jennings, Henry
Subject: Registry

Dear Mr. Jennings,

Residents of Maine have a right to protect their health and the health of their children. The application of chemicals is dangerous to our health. We deserve the right and courtesy to be informed if application of chemicals is to take place so we can protect ourselves.

So many people are developing chemical sensitivities, their bodies can not handle anymore chemicals. A system must be in place to alert them when chemicals are going to be used in their neighborhoods.

The two registries should be combined into one to eliminate confusion and very simple to sign up for.

Marsha Smith

--

Citizens For a Green Camden
Marsha Smith
Email: marsha@midcoast.com