

## Questions - Need to be Answered About 48 HR. Notification...



... Is to require mandatory neighbor notification for Lawn Care Pest Control treatments the right thing to do?

First, it would be wise to seek answers to these questions:

• 'Does it make sense', **is it the right thing to opt into mandatory notification without a thorough review of implications to our environment in this county?** Is it correct to accept at face value activist claims about dangers of pesticides, and what public policy must be?

• **Would it be right to go ahead and opt in without conducting and analyzing the consequences of a comprehensive environmental review (SEQR)?**

• **Is it right to ignore commercial applicators and their families being more routinely exposed from pesticide treatments, but not showing elevated health ailments, including cancer, etc.?**

• **Is it right not to consider applicators (some with many years exposure) are among the healthiest persons in society?**

• **Is it right to accept Activists' assertions children and pets are at unacceptable risk from lawn care pest control treatments, without considering evidence to the contrary?**

• **Is it right to say pesticides are dangerous, but ignore the fact that numerous pesticides are medicines too?**

• **Is it right to adopt mandatory notification without first seeing E.P.A., medical, and other authoritative studies and reports about pesticide use for outdoor lawn care?**

• **Is it the right thing to adopt mandatory notification without first verifying spray drift actually occurs? And if so, to what extent?**

• **If no drift occurs, is it fair that the supposed 'Right to Know' of an abutting neighbor allows intrusion into the 'Right of Privacy' about how one treats his or her property?**

• **With potentially many notifications occurring so closely together from different applicator companies treating neighboring properties (and**

**law covers do-it-yourselfers too), is it right not to expect endless confusion and countless inconveniences for those to be notified?**

• **Anti-pesticide activists describe lawn care science and technology as static. Is it right to accept this notion without first looking to see about improvements in lawn care management?**

• **Is it right not to discuss favorable evolving trends in lawn care science; in technology; in treatment methods; and in new generation pest control materials; - that afford even less exposure and less toxicity?**

• **Is it right to opt into mandatory notification without considering adverse impact on IPM (Integrated Pest Management, a program where timing is critical in the judicious and effective use of a pesticide.)?**

• **Is it the right policy to encourage greater pesticide use, ironically a likely consequence by opting into mandatory notification?**

• **Is it right to make trained D.E.C. commercially licensed applicators follow an overly burdensome, costly procedure with high liability and punitive penalties, to notify abutting property owners; and yet, exempt Do-It-Yourself homeowners spraying the same materials?**

• **For enforcement, shouldn't more consideration be given to evaluate fines and penalties as being exorbitant to the nature of the infractions? How is cost of mandatory notification to be paid? Activists say strong enforcement will generate fines sufficient to pay costs. Will this embolden activist-vigilantism? Is this the right approach?**

• **Is it right to make notification voluntary (as law states) for children and staff for indoor school pesticide applications; - and yet, require mandatory notification to off-premise neighbors for outdoor pest control treatments? Strange?**

• **As an alternative to mandatory notification, wouldn't it be right to consider the advantage of Voluntary Notification for outdoor pest control treatments?**