

From: [Brian Oakey](#)
To: [Janis Perry](#)
Subject: Fwd: {External}Rules Governing Pesticide and Chemigation Use and Application
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 1:47:51 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Julie Sheen <julie.givingground@gmail.com>
Date: September 22, 2020 at 1:43:05 PM MDT
To: Brian Oakey <Brian.Oakey@ISDA.IDAHO.GOV>
Subject: {External}Rules Governing Pesticide and Chemigation Use and Application

As an ISDA certified organic farmer, I urge the ISDA to reinstate the flight restrictions to cover populated areas such as schools and hospitals. It is unconscionable that Idaho would favor the pesticide applicators and chemical companies over its own children and vulnerable. The vague language in the new rules that terms "congested areas" as protected is designed to protect the chemical applicators when the drift, as it inevitably will, hits children, hospitals, and citizens in rural areas. Idaho is a rural state, and agriculture takes place in rural areas, does that mean we farmers and residents of rural areas should not be protected from pesticides? By the definition of "congested" that leaves most of Idaho open for spraying.

My family has lived in Idaho for generations, and if it were up to me, pesticides, which kill pollinators we depend on for food and make people sick, would not be used. But since they are used, can we not at least do all we can to ensure they reach their intended pest insect targets and not unsuspecting citizens? That means regulating the applicators with the most specific and clear language possible. Know that we as citizens are not dumb and can see right through attempts to do otherwise.

Farm workers also need protection, a voice, and a seat at the table when it comes to discussing pesticide application and field safety.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

--

Julie Sheen