

Mistretta, Susan

From: Diana Carpinone <d.carpinone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2020 3:24 PM
To: City Council - All
Cc: Joyal, Michael
Subject: Turf Treatment Bid B20067

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Dear Mayor Carrier and Council,

I was dismayed to see that the bid going out for turf treatment calls for a blanket application of synthetic grub control product to nearly 100 acres that would explicitly violate our commitment to organic land management practices resolution.

https://online2.dover.nh.gov/Tabs/Index/5734/public/1/deptnum/3/cab/Bids_and_Requests_for_Proposal

This product, Acelepryn with active ingredient chlorantraniliprole, has a half life of up to 1130 days. That's how long it takes to break down by half. That's just over 3 years. So just one application of this product would finally be broken down after 6 years.

This is what the EPA says about it, "Chlorantraniliprole may be characterized as persistent and mobile in terrestrial and aquatic environments. Extended chlorantraniliprole use is expected to cause accumulation of residues in soil from year to year." This is bad for water quality, soil health, and our health.

Not only would using this violate our resolution, but it would also violate the agreement with Stonyfield that the city voted to accept as a condition of the donation they received for Woodman Park school ball field, since for some reason Woodman was included in this bid.

Last year we saw a successful first year of a soil focused organic program where no pesticides were used - as grub monitoring revealed no need for even an organic product.

Why then would we put any chemical on that field - when there are no grubs? Why would we not continue that program, essentially throwing away the work done there and money already spent? Do you think Stonyfield would step up to donate money to us again for this program? I think not.

Even if Acelepryn were to be struck from the bid, and replaced with monitoring and spot treatment with an organic product when needed, we would still be looking at a "product swap" type program if exact bid specifications are met. This is when regularly scheduled synthetic applications are simply swapped out for organic ones. This is not a cost saving, or effective approach.

If it all possible, I believe Woodman Park ball field should be pulled from the bid and the program from last year continued.

I have spoken to Chip Osborne, and I know that he has offered to help Dover for free, above and beyond his contract with Stonyfield. That offer still stands.

I assume the final decision will land in the hands of the council, and so I urge you all to vote the way you did with our curbside weed control bid. Thanks to your vote we will be using an organic product that has a half-life

of about half a day. This means it will break down so quickly that none of it should reach our watershed, when applied according to the law.

This was a wise choice considering the other option was a blanket application of pre-emergent synthetic herbicide that would be broadcast sprayed along the entire 30 miles of curblin, then another herbicide would be sprayed to kill the weeds that still germinate. This is much the same over-kill approach as applying "preventative" chemical grub control to 100 acres - whether grubs are there or not.

A true preventative approach would be initiating pest monitoring at the right time in the season, and then spot treating any areas that exceed the threshold with an organic product. This would save a LOT of money, and be a much better choice for public health, water quality, and the health of the soil.

When this comes up for a vote, I urge you to continue on the path you have taken already this season with curbside weed control, and to direct the city staff to accept the free expert help available to us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Diana Carpinone
President
[Non Toxic Communities](#)
Director
[Non Toxic Dover NH](#)
d.carpinone@gmail.com
617 816-8290