



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

Janet Rathbun <janet.a.rathbun@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 2:39 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Dear Mr. Moon,

As residents of Portland for the past 40 years, we strongly urge every member of the Portland City Council to support a pesticide ban as strong as, or stronger than, the recently-enacted South Portland ordinance. We oppose the IPM draft ordinance because it does not go far enough to assure that public health is protected. We live just above Back Cove, and our yard has been pesticide-free, herbicide-free and free of synthetic fertilizers for many, many years. We take comfort in knowing that animals and children are not harmed by being on our lawn, but our surrounding neighbors all still use pesticides and herbicides, and we are very uncomfortable knowing that runoff of these chemicals is making its way into Back Cove. The pursuit of perfect, green lawns has done significant damage to the environment, and the damage will continue unless a comprehensive pesticide ban is enacted.

Please make Portland the kind of leader it should be in banning pesticides and herbicides through a comprehensive organic lawn care ordinance like those in place in South Portland and Ogunquit!

Sincerely,

Janet Rathbun
Peter McDonald
101 Austin St.
Portland Me 04103



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

Eleanor Morse <eleanor.morse@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 1:59 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Dear Troy Moon,

I am writing to urge you to support the passage of a South Portland style ordinance that sets a standard only for those pesticides approved for use in organic management systems, as defined in the National Organic Program. Please pass this message on to committee members. I hope that Portland can become one of the nationwide leaders in this important effort.

All the best,

Eleanor Morse
Peaks Island, Maine



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

jplumm4@aol.com <jplumm4@aol.com>

Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 11:31 AM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Troy Moon,

Thank you for considering the support of your Portland neighbors as you manage the important issue of pesticide application in this great city.

South Portland has courageously worked to manage this issue effectively!!
Please follow their lead and their style ordinance, we desperately need an organic standard as well.

In the midst of national chaos and such a feeling of insecurity please help us make our small world of Portland safe and healthy for all; there will be a trickle up effect.

Thank you sincerely

Joanne Plummer
94 Woodfords Street
Portland Maine

MOFGA member



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide Task Force Feedback

1 message

Jennifer Lunden <jleelunden@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 10:22 AM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Dear Members of the Pesticide Task Force:

My name is Jennifer Lunden and I live in the Parkside neighborhood. I am a psychotherapist and an environmental writer. I'm writing to request that you work with Portland Protectors to enact a comprehensive synthetic pesticide ordinance like many towns and cities all over North America are doing to protect our citizens and our pets and wildlife. Glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup, was once billed as a "safer" pesticide, but the World Health Organization recently reclassified it as a probable carcinogen. Independent studies also link Roundup and other pesticides to autism, male infertility, kidney failure, and Parkinson's disease. And of course, Roundup and other pesticides kill bees. And we all know about the massive bee die-off that is happening all over the country. We need bees for food.

Roundup is also a big contributor to the die-off of monarch butterflies. When the City sprays the stray milkweed plants the pop up around Portland, it kills every caterpillar and every monarch butterfly that would have fed on that milkweed—the monarch's only food. Have you seen the monarchs that gather in the shrubbery every fall by the East End Beach? Those monarchs are in peril. In fact, the entire world population of monarch butterflies is in peril, in part due to pesticides.

Portland is a progressive city. I believe we can find another way to manage weeds in this city, just as towns and cities all over North America are doing. I ask you to do that for my safety, for the health and safety of my dog, for my neighbors and their children, and for the butterflies and the bees.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Lunden



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

"Pesticide task force feedback."

1 message

Hugh Hill <hugh.e.hill@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 10:00 AM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

I attended the last task force meeting (old guy, Pats hoodie, orange hat). I live in Riverton (29 Eastlawn Rd.) in a single family home we own. We pay our taxes and vote. We are gardeners with a Bee Safe Yard. I think Portland should make a **toothless** ordinance similar to SoPo's, but much better (after all we've got the Whole Foods Market). Forget the IPM ordinance because it doesn't inspire. Where we can seize the high ground is to focus on **healthy soils**. This ordinance, like the Declaration of Independence, will be informational while suggesting the direction we should be heading. Citizens can learn about the suggested approaches by following the lead of the City on Public Land.

Hugh Hill



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Task Force, Pesticide Ord.

1 message

Priscilla Skerry <drskerry@myfairpoint.net>

Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 9:49 AM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Hi Troy. Thank you for passing this on to Councilor Mavadones and the Task Force Members.

December 11, 2016

To: Portland Pesticide Task Force Members

Dear Task Force Chair, Nick Mavadones and Task Force Members,

There is quote by Edward O. Wilson, professor emeritus at Harvard U. and former Pulitzer Prize winner, that may be very appropriate to what you all have been entrusted to do in developing a Pesticide Ordinance ultimately meant to eliminate the use of pesticides that are being deemed more and more to be harmful to people, our ecosystem and our environment. Wilson writes: "We are the stewards, not the owners of our ecosystem."

Because the EPA ,up to this point, has not required conclusive and independent safety testing of the thousands of chemicals we all are now presently exposed to, it doesn't know and can't proclaim the full impact of these on us and our environment. * This makes it imperative that the use of any present or future chemical be based on the precautionary principle.** This is the basis of the S.Portland Ordinance which has, as its ultimate goal the prohibition--except under rare circumstances where needed, and as permitted by Federal and State law-- of pesticides that are suspected of being harmful to human and environmental health...be they natural or synthetic.

At the last Task Force meeting on 12/6/16, a second ordinance was introduced that models very closely the one passed by S. Portland this year. It was introduced to be considered along side the still problematic and controversial ordinance put forth and promoted by those members of the Task Force who are aligned with Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices. This is not meant to denigrate those practices or practitioners in any way. Their training and education are commendable and necessary, but there is a huge philosophical difference in approach in each of the ordinances now before you. The one (IPM Ordinance) continues to promote the use of pesticides, while the other (S.Portland Ordinance), is based in precautionary principles, strives to educate the public and practitioners in new organic soil promoting, health promoting practices that--whenever possible--eradicate pesticide use. The process undertaken by the S.Portland citizens and their City Council, during which they called for and listened to expert witnesses from both sides, led to the development of an ordinance that puts clear goals in place, is not initially punitive...seeks instead to base acceptance of safe organic methods in education. And it includes IPM practices and practitioners as deemed appropriate and necessary.

At the conclusion of the last Task Force meeting, and in the spirit of collaboration, a suggestion was made to try to meld these two ordinances. Given the philosophical differences, that is not possible. But the two are not mutually exclusive, and this is what the S.Portland ordinance accomplishes.

Before any attempt to meld these two ordinances, and given that there are no members of the Task Force whose practices are based primarily in organic principles and philosophy, I strongly urge that you support a draft ordinance based on S.Portland's ordinance, and hold a public hearing in order to help the task force understand the profound differences between the two. Thank you for considering this.

Priscilla Skerry, N.D.
Naturopathic Doctor
100 Brickhill Ave. Suite 304
S.Portland, Maine 04106

Resident:
95 Emery St.
Portland, Maine 04102

*I think it is necessary to understand that the EPA hasn't been able to require this kind of testing due to the political and economic nature of the interactions that have grown between government and corporations, especially in regard to lack of funding over the past decades.

**Precautionary Principle: prohibited use until there are appropriate scientific government publicly funded along side privately funded studies done to prove safe



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

(no subject)

carrieryba@gmail.com <carrieryba@gmail.com>
To: "thm@portlandmaine.gov" <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Sun, Dec 11, 2016 at 9:49 AM

I SUPPORT the South Portland style draft ordinance or enact something even stronger and more protective of public health.

I OPPOSE the IPM draft ordinance as it doesn't set an organic standard (like the South Portland ordinance) and allows each individual applicator (whether licensed professional or uneducated homeowner) to pick whatever pesticides they feel are appropriate.

In contrast, the South Portland ordinance only allows pesticides approved for use in organic management systems, as defined in the National Organic Program.

Organic land care ordinances (such as the ones passed in South Portland and Ogunquit) are based on the desire to provide the greatest protection of public health. IPM is what the city and all professional pesticide applicators currently follow and is based on economic and aesthetic thresholds rather than public health protection.

A concerned mother of two,

Carrie Morris



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

Kate Pendleton <katependleton@gmail.com>
To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Sat, Dec 10, 2016 at 8:22 PM

Dear Mr Moon and Pesticide task force,

Please, I urge you to support the South Portland style draft ordinance or enact something even stronger and more protective of public health. Also, please know that I oppose the IPM draft ordinance as it doesn't set an organic standard (like the South Portland ordinance) and allows each individual applicator (whether licensed professional or uneducated homeowner) to pick whatever pesticides they feel are appropriate. In contrast, the South Portland ordinance only allows pesticides approved for use in organic management systems, as defined in the National Organic Program.

Organic land care ordinances (such as the ones passed in South Portland and Ogunquit) are based on the desire to provide the greatest protection of public health. IPM is what the city and all professional pesticide applicators currently follow and is based on economic and aesthetic thresholds rather than public health protection.

Please think of the health of our people.
Thank you,
Kate Pendleton



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

Bryn Sewell <bryn.sewell@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 9, 2016 at 7:46 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Dear Mr. Moon,

I am writing this as a concerned mother, nurse practitioner and voting citizen. I want to add my voice to those who are writing you in support of the South Portland style draft ordinance. The uncontrolled use of pesticides is a health hazard for humans, and has terrible implications on the health of our ecological balance in general. There are many safe, organic options for trivial domestic lawn care that do not have lasting implications for the health and well-being of humans and other animals and plants, as well as other uses of pesticides.

I am opposed to the IPM draft ordinance because it does not set an organic standard. This standard is an important aspect of the legislation.

Especially with the new leader of the EPA being Mr. Pruitt, it is more vital than ever for local government to ensure that its legislation takes very seriously its mandate to protect and care for its citizens.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this vital issue.

Bronwyn Sewell, nurse practitioner

94 Hope Ave
Portland, ME 04013
207-577-5926



Sierra Club Maine
44 Oak St. Ste. 301
Portland, ME 04101
maine.chapter@sierraclub.org
(207) 761-5616
www.sierraclub.org/maine

December 9, 2016

Dear Mr. Moon and Councilor Mavodones,

On behalf of the more than 4000 Sierra Club members and supporters in Portland, I am writing to voice our support for the proposed draft organic land care ordinance based on the ordinance passed by the City of South Portland.

Indiscriminate use of lawn care pesticides poses a number of environmental and public health dangers, particularly to children. Leading scientific bodies including EPA, American Academy of Pediatrics, National Academy of Sciences and the 2010 President's Cancer Panel have linked pesticide exposure to reproductive disorders, birth defects, learning disabilities, neurological disease, endocrine disorders and cancer. The widely used pesticide known as "Roundup" is considered a probable carcinogen by the World Health Organization.

In addition to the threat to human health, pesticides are harmful to wildlife. More than 12 different pesticides have been detected in Casco Bay, and pesticides are known to endanger honeybees, pets, and other animals.

In contrast to the IPM draft ordinance, the South Portland-inspired land care draft ordinance allows the use of only those pesticides approved in organic management systems as defined in the National Organic Program. This critically important provision will ensure that Portland's ordinance will be able to meet its goal to protect public health and safety from toxic pesticides.

Sierra Club Maine urges the Task Force to approve the organic land care ordinance for review and adoption by the full City Council.

Sincerely,

Glen Brand
Chapter Director



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

pesticidetaskforcefeedback

1 message

mabel5555@twc.com <mabel5555@twc.com>

Fri, Dec 9, 2016 at 12:35 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

I urge the task force to support the S. Portland style draft ordinance or enact something even stronger and more protective of public health. I oppose the IPM draft ordinance as it doesn't set an organic standard, and allow individual applicators to pick any pesticides. Mabel O'Brien, Casco Baykeepers



December 9, 2016

City of Portland
Pesticide Task Force
389 Congress St
Portland ME 04101

PO Box 4744
Portland ME 04112
207.210.0084
www.psrmaine.org

Members of the Portland Pesticide Task Force,

Physicians for Social Responsibility Maine Chapter, a statewide organization working on issues of toxics and pesticides, believes that everyone who lives in or visits Portland has the right to drink clean water, breath clean air, and play, walk, and be active on turf and lawns that are free from dangerous chemicals.

Staff

Karen A D'Andrea
Executive Director

As medical and healthcare professionals and advocates, we work to prevent what cannot be cured. Because conventional lawn and turf care products often contain chemicals that have been linked to a number of health problems and because many of these chemicals have not been properly tested, we should not expose our citizens, especially our children, to these potentially dangerous toxins.

Board of Directors

Daniel Oppenheim, MD
President

Studies have shown links to leukemia, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma, and brain tumors in addition to birth defects, decreased birth weights and neurodevelopmental disorders in children.

James Maier, MD
Vice President

Doug Dransfield, MD
Clerk

Children are more vulnerable because of their proximity to the ground. Toddlers, preschoolers, and even older children are often on the ground sitting, crawling, and playing. Young children explore their world by putting toys and even grass, dirt, and their hands and fingers in their mouths. Older children may, after exposure, inadvertently eat without washing their hands or touch their eyes or mouth without thinking. Even sliding into home base could result in kicking up pesticide residues that could be inhaled.

Sydney Sewall, MD
Treasurer

Lani Graham, MD, MPH

Paul Liebow, MD

Because many chemicals found in pesticides have never been properly tested or because some have been associated with serious disease and illness, the best way to avoid exposure to pesticides used in lawn and turf care is to ban their use, particularly in public areas.

Paul Perkins, MD

Peter Wilk, MD

We believe the risks to human health for a visually desirable, ornamental lawns and turf are too high when the same can be achieved through organic means.

We support OPM restrictions similar to that of the recently passed South Portland ban on the use of conventional lawn and turf products. We do not believe that the use of an IPM approach goes far enough to protect health.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Karen A D'Andrea", written over a horizontal line.

Karen A D'Andrea
Executive Director



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

Brian Simpson <ultimatenurse@gmail.com>
To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Fri, Dec 9, 2016 at 4:36 AM

Pesticide use is important. However right now it is used for economic and aesthetic reasons. It is not regulated for public health. I support an ordinance similar to the south portland regulation requiring organic use only.

Did you know that Cuba has had no loss of bees? This is supported directly by the evidence that they were unable to import any pesticide due to the embargo. Bees are an incredibly important agricultural and environmental resource, without them we wouldn't be able to eat.

I urge the task force to take strong action on this issue.

Thank you,

Brian Simpson
41 Lucas street
Portland Maine.



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Organic task force

Megan <heavenor@gmail.com>
To: Thm@portlandmaine.gov

Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 8:40 PM

I live on Munjoy Hill and support managing Portland's lands organically. I believe our little city should be a leader, and come out with a strong ordinance that declares we prioritize the health of our citizens and the future of our home here. Thank you- Megan Hevenor

Pesticide Usage - Please stop

1 message

Michelle Schumacher <michelle@grklaw.com>

Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 4:53 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Good afternoon

I am writing today to ask that you stop using pesticides and herbicides for landscaping purposes. These toxic chemicals not only in small doses harm our health, kill pollinators and poison our ground water and ocean. It is imperative the cheap janitorial maintenance approach is replaced with a less toxic alternative for the sake of all of our health. It is not worth the cancer to kill a harmless dandelion. Additionally, less water is needed for healthy plants, when you spray the plants and soil are compromised for some time.

Below please find more information and some evidence for the concern. Thank you

Dr. Kremer interview (4-2015)- <http://foodintegritynow.org/2015/04/15/dr-robert-kremer-gmos-glyphosate-and-soil-biology/>

Dr. Huber article by Robyn O'Brien (4-2015)- <http://robynobrien.com/an-unlikely-scientist-and-retired-colonel-calling-out-glyphosate-before-it-was-in-fashion/>

IARC Monographs Volume 112: evaluation of five organophosphate insecticides and herbicides (3-2015)- <http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/pdf/MonographVolume112.pdf>

Widespread Glyphosate Contamination in USA- Institute of Science in Society (2014)- http://www.i-sis.org.uk/Widespread_Glyphosate_Contamination_in_US.php

Glyphosate Testing Report: Findings in American Mothers' Breast Milk, Urine and Water. (4-2015)-

http://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/yesmaam/pages/774/attachments/original/1396803706/Glyphosate_Final_in_the_breast_milk_of_American_women_Draft6_.pdf?1396803706

Glyphosate's effects on soil biology

<http://www.iuss.org/19th%20WCSS/Symposium/pdf/1807.pdf>

Preliminary evidence that glyphosate harms bees

<http://jeb.biologists.org/content/217/19/3457.long>

All my best

Michelle Schumacher



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

Diana Carpinone <d.carpinone@gmail.com>
To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 4:52 PM

Dear Mr. Moon,

I am writing in my support for the South Portland style draft ordinance. This is a minimally appropriate way to protect the health of Portland residents and the surrounding environment. using it as a basis for an even stronger protective ordinance would be an excellent choice.

The IPM draft ordinance is completely inadequate as it allows toxic pesticide use to continue, and does not set a standard the way the South Portland draft has. I firmly oppose it.

I urge the task force to please support the South Portland style draft ordinance.

Thank you,

Diana Carpinone



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

1 message

Sheila Sullivan <sheila@gwi.net>
To: Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 12:14 PM

To the Members of the Portland Pesticide Task Force:

I am writing to urge the task force to **SUPPORT the South Portland style draft ordinance**, which allows only pesticides approved for use in organic management systems, as defined in the National Organic Program. I am **opposed to the IPM draft ordinance**, as it doesn't set an organic standard, and allows each individual applicator to purchase whatever pesticides they feel are appropriate.

Organic land care ordinances (such as the ones passed in South Portland and Ogunquit) are based on the desire to provide the greatest protection of public health. I am concerned that IPM is based on economic and aesthetic thresholds, rather than public health protection.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Sheila Sullivan
398 Ray St.
Portland



PEAKS ISLAND COUNCIL

October 28, 2015

Attn.: Chair, Portland City Council
Transportation, Sustainability and Energy Committee
388 Congress Street
Portland, ME 04101

Dear Transportation, Sustainability and Energy
Committee Members of the Portland City Council,

In a unanimous decision by the Peaks Island Council at the September 23rd meeting, 2015, the PIC voted to support the passage of the draft Pesticide Ordinance submitted to your committee by Portland Protectors.

Peaks Island is a small, fragile, oceanside community, and the PIC is concerned for the health of Casco Bay, our island ecosystem, and the health of our residents, because of unregulated use of dangerous chemicals that find their way into our environment.

Please support the passage of this draft ordinance to help protect our environment and future generations enjoying and living in the Casco Bay area.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Anne Mitchell
Chair, Peaks Island Council



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide Task Force Feedback

Sarah Braik <sbraik642@gmail.com>
To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 7:38 AM

Good morning Mr. Moon,

I am a Portland resident writing in support of a South-Portland-type pesticide bill that includes organic standards (as opposed to the IPM Draft Ordinance). We need a strong ordinance to protect the health of our residents, especially children who spend a lot of time outdoors and are more vulnerable to poisons.

Portland has been a leader in environmental issues and I would like to see Portland continue to set a strong example for other cities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah M. Braik
457 Cumberland Avenue, Apt. 42
Portland ME 04101

Sarah M. Braik, SCHC

To learn more about the SCHC and Adelynrood, our retreat center, visit www.adelynrood.org or our [Facebook page](#)."

"As Desmond Tutu told me on a recent trip to Capetown, 'We're only the light bulbs, Richard, and our job is just to remain screwed in.'"

Richard Rohr, in [Falling Upward](#)



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task force feedback

chanti@odie.be <chanti@odie.be>
To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 7:09 AM

To :

Sustainability Coordinator Troy Moon,

Dear Sir,

I urge the task force to SUPPORT the South Portland style draft ordinance or enact something even stronger and more protective of public health.

I also want to state my OPPOSITION to the IPM draft ordinance as it doesn't set an organic standard (like the South Portland ordinance) and allows each individual applicator (whether licensed professional or uneducated homeowner) to pick whatever pesticides they feel are appropriate.

In contrast, the South Portland ordinance only allows pesticides approved for use in organic management systems, as defined in the National Organic Program.

Organic land care ordinances (such as the ones passed in South Portland and Ogunquit) are based on the desire to provide the greatest protection of public health. IPM is what the city and all professional pesticide applicators currently follow and is based on economic and aesthetic thresholds rather than public health protection.

Sincerely,
Chantal Buslot
Belgium



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide Task Force Feedback

1 message

Alyssa Owens <afowens1@msn.com>
To: "thm@portlandmaine.gov" <thm@portlandmaine.gov>
Cc: Alyssa Owens <afowens1@msn.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 2:47 PM

I support the South Portland draft ordinance, in opposition to the IPM draft ordinance. Here's why.

1. IPM is not necessary. It is not as safe as it sounds. There probably never is oversight by state inspectors when IPM is applied. We know for fact that in New Hampshire, there is a very small number of inspectors paid to oversee the pesticide applications of over 2,000 "trained" professionals. We have witnessed pesticides being put down in wrongful weather conditions and without warnings to the public.
2. We know that pesticide formulas are a mix of chemicals that have never been fully tested. That we and our children and pets, bats and honey bees... are adversely affected from exposures.
3. We know that certain organics and natural remedies work and they do not cause harm to human or the environmental health.
4. The use of pesticides can exacerbate a problem whether it is a contamination from lice or grubs, weeds or mosquitoes.

It is of the utmost importance that we not continue with the dangerous, extreme pesticide use status quo.

My family and I have enjoyed many summer trips to the great state of Maine. When we see cities and towns making wise choices with their land and building care, we are encouraged to continue our visits.

Alyssa Owens

Public Health Advocate
Community Events Planner
<http://backtoclover.blogspot.com>

Experience is wisdom.



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide Task Force feedback

1 message

Molindr <molindr@aol.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 2:32 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

To the Pesticide Task Force:

I **urge the Portland Pesticide Task Force to SUPPORT the South Portland style draft ordinance** or enact something even stronger and more protective of public health. In addition I am opposed **to the IPM draft ordinance** as it doesn't set an organic standard (like the South Portland ordinance) and allows each individual applicator (whether licensed professional or uneducated homeowner) to pick whatever pesticides they feel are appropriate. In contrast, the South Portland ordinance only allows pesticides approved for use in organic management systems, as defined in the National Organic Program.

Organic land care ordinances (such as the ones passed in South Portland and Ogunquit) are based on the desire to provide the greatest public health protection. IPM is what the city and all professional pesticide applicators currently follow and is based on economic and aesthetic thresholds rather than public health protection.

Respectfully,

Melinda Molin MD

December 4, 2016

Dear Portland City Council

I would like to strongly endorse approval of legislation currently before the City Council limiting the use of synthetic chemicals to control weeds within the city of Portland City. Pesticides can be harmful to humans , pets, plants, and natural ecosystems. I know that I've used vinegar to effectively control weeds near my house and would like to ask the city to consider alternative practices and products as well. Given the availability of viable alternative practices and products it seems to make sense to keep our community as chemical free as possible. Our neighbor, South Portland has effectively implemented such a regimen and I strongly urge you to protect the health of the citizens of Portland by approving this measure.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anita Stewart". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Anita Stewart
23 O'Brion Street
Portland ME 04101



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide Task Force Feedback

1 message

John Mason <nosamej@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 16, 2016 at 1:37 PM

To: thm@portlandmaine.gov

Mr Moon, please forward this letter to the members of the city's pesticide task force before their meeting December 21st. Thank you.

Dear fellow citizens concerned about the dangers to the environment and to public health --

I urge you to draft an ordinance significantly stronger than the one developed in South Portland. While that ordinance is highly admirable in its position on the necessary organic methods of management, it falls short in the required guarantees of monitoring and enforcement. Current methods of management and oversight are woefully inadequate and therefore a constant threat to the health of all residents of -- and visitors to -- our community, and to our fragile environment.

I see that there is another, lesser draft ordinance that reads like a mockery of the responsibility we should all bring to this issue. I implore you *not* to give credence to the insufficient standards embodied therein.

Please do the right thing and protect us all, and protect the many vulnerable pollinators that help feed and delight us.

John E Mason
206 State Street
Portland ME 04101
12/16/16



Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Pesticide task Force feedback

Mike Peaslee <mikepeaslee@modernpest.com>
To: Troy Moon <thm@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Dec 14, 2016 at 3:18 PM

Hi Troy,

Thanks for sharing this with the committee members. I attended the meeting last Monday and can see that you have a pretty daunting task still in trying to come up with a proposal that might be acceptable to all of the members. Clearly there are different views of different members and trying to find solutions that will be acceptable to all interested parties looks to be quite a challenge.

I say that to get to my point on some comments that were made during the meeting Monday evening, I was quite interested in Avery's comment towards the end of the meeting that "structural is exempt". I know there are some specific exemptions in both of the draft proposals that are relevant to us in the structural pest management industry, but they don't cover all aspects of structural exterior pest management services. I'm wondering if this was just an overly broad statement by Avery or if in fact the intent of the task force is to include a provision that exempts exterior structural pest management services as a whole?

Keeping in mind that the reasons for our services are to protect peoples health, property, the food supply, etc. I see our services differently than what most people see as the "aesthetic" use of pesticides. While I could argue that those other uses are actually beneficial as well my primary interest is obviously in how any proposed ordinance would impact the structural industry. If the intent of the task force is to exclude structural pest management as was stated in the meeting on Monday I would respectfully ask that in the ongoing process of drafting an ordinance that this be more clearly spelled out. I feel that may not only be beneficial to the Task Force members so there are not any possible misconceptions as to what the ordinances actual intent is, but if the proposed ordinance were to be adopted by the city I believe having it clearly spelled out in the ordinance language that structural pest management uses are exempt could potentially prevent a great deal of questions or confusion in the future about those uses as well.

Respectfully,

Mike

Mike Peaslee
Technical Manager
Associate Certified Entomologist
Modern Pest Services
Brunswick, Maine 04011
207-721-0167 Office
207-632-0318 Cell
mikepeaslee@modernpest.com

Mike Peaslee
Technical Manager
Associate Certified Entomologist
Modern Pest Services
Brunswick, Maine 04011
207-721-0167 Office
207-632-0318 Cell
mikepeaslee@modernpest.com

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]