

# David Bakke

Please consider my comments when finalizing these proposed new regulations:

- This new notification system appears to be based on responses received from people living in a couple of small farming communities in the Central Valley that are surrounded by intensive agriculture production including the use of restricted-use pesticides. Yet the state is proposing to implement this notification system statewide, impacting thousands of landowners involved in agricultural production, no matter how close their land is to homes, schools, towns, etc. The economic costs will be borne by the landowners alone.
- In the statement of reasons, it is mentioned that in these test communities, people wanted to especially know about applications near schools and homes. If that is the case, why doesn't DPR consider limiting the notification requirement to those areas within a certain distance of homes or schools? I have been involved in the forestry sector over my career (which as you know is considered agricultural production). Most forest land in the state that is in production is well removed from schools and homes, yet would still be required to take part in this notification system. For what purpose?
- In my forestry experience, the people that would be reading the posted notices would more likely be living in cities many miles from the actual application (maybe even out of state). Their purpose in gaining this information would not be out of concern for their home or their children's school, but rather to harass or otherwise try to disrupt the lawful application of a restricted-use pesticide that is occurring miles from them or the nearest homes or schools. Has DPR considered this?
- I call for DPR to consider placing a distance from schools, homes, etc., in the proposed regulations.

David Bakke