

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS—CHAPTERS 20, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33 AND 41—AUGUST 2014

PUBLIC HEARING, AUGUST 8, 2014

END OF COMMENT PERIOD, AUGUST 22, 2014

<b>TESTIMONY AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED</b>			
<b>Person/Affiliation</b>	<b>Summary of Testimony</b>	<b>Type of Comment</b>	<b>Board Response</b>
Ted Quaday Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association	Ch. 20 – Supports the proposal to require positive identification of the application site. Questions what the Board policy will require. Supports use of at least two means of identification. Suggests periodic review and updating of the policy. Ch. 28 – Supports public notification of pesticide use. Questions the efficacy of newspaper notices. Suggests revisiting the automated web-based notification system discussed previously by the Board.	Written	
Darin Hammond Jasper Wyman & Son	Ch. 22 – The Board is asking companies to implement drift management plans when spraying under categories 6A and some aspects of 6B. Chapter 22 no longer references a drift management plan. Believes Ch. 22 adequately addresses drift management as it is.	Oral and written	
Nicolas Hahn, Gerry Mirabile Central Maine Power Company	Ch. 22 – Support exempting category 6B from the requirement to identify sensitive areas. Ch. 28 – Believe posting of substations is unnecessary and excessive for substations since access is restricted anyway. Propose exempting restricted-access substations. Oppose publication of advance notice of category 6A applications since they are targeted applications made by non-powered equipment. Propose exempting utility ROWs.	Oral and written comments	

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS—CHAPTERS 20, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33 AND 41—AUGUST 2014

PUBLIC HEARING, AUGUST 8, 2014

END OF COMMENT PERIOD, AUGUST 22, 2014

<b>TESTIMONY AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED</b>			
<b>Person/Affiliation</b>	<b>Summary of Testimony</b>	<b>Type of Comment</b>	<b>Board Response</b>
Chris Everest Commercial Applicator	Ch. 22 – Observes there are a lot of sensitive areas to identify for mosquito applications. Ch. 28 – Appreciates that the Board is willing to make changes that alleviate administrative burdens.	Written	
Brian Chateauvert Railroad Weed Control	Ch. 28 – Posting of category 6B areas could be very difficult on the railroad sidings. These are large open areas where the public is normally not allowed.	Oral	
Chuck Cotton Lucas Tree Experts	Ch. 20, 22, 31, 32, 33 and 41 – Supports changes as proposed. Ch. 28 – Observes that the proposed amendments to Ch. 28 include a new newspaper notification requirement for applications made under categories 6A and some aspects of 6B. [The Board has been requiring newspaper notification for variances from Ch. 22, but not for applications that do not require a variance (e.g. non-powered equipment).] Opposes the new requirement mainly because they do a lot of applications on small industrial or residential sites for which newspaper advertising would serve no purpose, might discourage some clients and would therefor damage their business.	Written	

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS—CHAPTERS 20, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33 AND 41—AUGUST 2014

PUBLIC HEARING, AUGUST 8, 2014

END OF COMMENT PERIOD, AUGUST 22, 2014

<b>TESTIMONY AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED</b>			
<b>Person/Affiliation</b>	<b>Summary of Testimony</b>	<b>Type of Comment</b>	<b>Board Response</b>
Mark Lamberton Emera Maine	Ch. 28 – Observes that the proposed amendments to Ch. 28 include a new newspaper notification requirement for applications made under categories 6A and some aspects of 6B. [The Board has been requiring newspaper notification for variances from Ch. 22, but not for applications that do not require a variance (e.g. non-powered equipment).] Questions the efficacy of newspaper notices. Notes that utility lines are linear and therefor cross through many towns and are often remote, making them difficult to describe in a way that is meaningful to the public. Additional newspaper and posting requirements would be a financial burden. Proposes exempting category 6A from the newspaper notification and suggests that utility companies include vegetation management information on the company website.	Written	
Glenn Nadeau Emera Maine	Notes discrepancies in the category names as described in various Board rules. Ch. 28 – Clarifies that the proposal will now require newspaper notices for applications made under category 6A [The Board has been requiring newspaper notification for variances from Ch. 22, but not for applications that do not require a variance (e.g. non-powered equipment).].	Written	

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS—CHAPTERS 20, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33 AND 41—AUGUST 2014

PUBLIC HEARING, AUGUST 8, 2014

END OF COMMENT PERIOD, AUGUST 22, 2014

<b>TESTIMONY AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED</b>			
<b>Person/Affiliation</b>	<b>Summary of Testimony</b>	<b>Type of Comment</b>	<b>Board Response</b>
Christian Bulleman III Commercial Applicator	Ch. 31 – Questions the exemption for antimicrobial hardware. Unclear whether it applies to UV and IR mechanical systems as written, and believes that it should not.	Written	
Dennis Shellabarger	Ch. 41 – Opposes deregulation of hexazinone as proposed which would no longer prohibit application by air assisted equipment.	Written	